DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 764 EA 012 993

AUTHOR Willner, Robin
TITLE Allocation of Tax Levy Funds to New York City High Schools.
INSTITUTION Educational Priorities Panel, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 15 May 79
NOTE 198p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility: Administrator Role: *Attendance: *Boards of Education: Budgeting: *Contracts: *Differentiated Staffs: Efficiency: Equal Education: Expenditures: Financial Needs: High Schools: Principals: *Resource Allocation: School Taxes: Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Funding Formulas: *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The Educational Priorities Panel examined the allocation of tax levy funds to New York City academic and vocational high schools. The study attempted a statistical analysis of the actual distribution and utilization of funds for the fall terms 1975 through 1978. It also aimed to identify current budgeting and management practices that interfere with the delivery of quality education. A third goal of the study was to make recommendations that would effectively increase the worth of monies available by raising productivity and flexibility. Data were taken from board of education documents and interviews with principals, superintendents, and central office administrators. The study was based on the premise that the principal should have more flexibility and more accountability in administering the school and distributing resources. Following the discussion of the allocation of funds to high schools, six areas needing reform or improvement are discussed: differentiated staffing, management practices at central divisions of the board of education, contract provisions, disincentives in the formula for the improvement of attendance, flexibility in the expenditure of funds, and the equitable distribution of funds. Finally, there is a discussion of a proposed per capita allocation formula. (Author/JM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED193764

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ALLOCATION OF TAX LEVY FUNDS TO NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES PANEL

May 15, 1979

Project Director: Robin Willner Consultant: Clare Comiskey

For further information, please contact the EPP, c/o INTERFACE,
95 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016, (212) 686-3348

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Willner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 012 993

Management Staff (INTERFACE)

Stanley S. Litow, Director
David N. Lebenstein, Associate Director
Norman H. Chung, Associate Director
Walter Armstrong
Ferne Farber
Robin Willner
Donald Hazen
Susan Amlung

Support Staff

Amy Adams
Barbara Gevertzman
Sophie Hayes
Sandra Moore
Sally Roskill

PRECIS

The Educational Priorites Panel (EPP) examined the allocation of tax levy funds to New York City academic and vocational high schools. The major portion of this money is currently distributed according to a unit allocation formula.

The Panel believes that the school principal is the person most able to allocate resources so as to serve the individual pupil population of a specific school, making optimum use of personnel. This report makes recommendations which would increase a principal's flexibility in managing a school, while insuring maximum accountability for all decisions. These recommendations concern staffing at the high school level as well as management practices at central divisions of the Board of Education which affect the high schools.

The Panel has also examined the unit allocation formula itself. EPP analyzed the distribution of funds and found that the existing formula results in an inequitable distribution of funds. The formula relies heavily on the curriculum index, or the average number of instructional periods provided to students daily. Those schools which have offered more courses to their students in prior years will be given the resources to continue to do so while those schools which offered fewer courses will be maintained at the same level of funding, unless the school is able to increase services without additional resources. Linked to the question of equity is that of flexibility. The formula rewards certain educational decisions and punishes those schools which offer different types of services, whether or not they are educationally sound. Guidance, educational assistants in the classrooms, small class size, and resource materials are examples of services which would be too "expensive" for a high school and, if offered, could possibly result in reduced funding in the succeeding year.

The Panel makes several additional recommendations regarding the structure of the formula:

1. OTPS and school aide hours should be included within the unit allocation.

2. Units should be distributed on a per capita basis.

 a) The adjusted audited register should continue to be the basis for the allocation.

 b) Funds should be allocated for long-term absentees at a lower rate to provide an incentive to serve these students and bring them back into the schools.

c) Recognizing the budget cuts that all of the high schools have sustained in the past four years, sufficient funds should be reallocated to upgrade those schools which have been hurt by the present formula and insure that no school will lose funds due to the per capita allocation.

The Educational Priorities Panel would like to thank Dr. Nathan Quinones, Executive Director of the Division of High Schools, Arthur Auerbach, Stan Klein, personnel at the Division of High Schools, and the high school principals who co-operated with us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	i-iii
Summary and Recommendations	vi-xvi
Chapter I: Tax Levy Funding for the New York City High Schools	1
Chapter II: Differentiated Staffing in the High Schools	11
Chapter III: Management Practices at Central Divisions of the Board of Education	39
Chapter IV: Contract Provisions	67
Chapter V: Disincentives Within the Formula to Improve Attendance	75
Chapter VI: Flexibility in the Expenditure of Funds	103
Chapter VII: The Equitable Distribution of Funds	113
Chapter VIII: Proposed Per Capita Allocation	129
Appendices	145

INTRODUCTION

The Educational Priorities Panel, having studied many of the centrally-administered programs at the New York City Board of Education in the past, undertook an assessment of the Division of High Schools, an instructional area that is centrally controlled. The high schools, in contrast to community school districts, receive tax-levy funds for Personal Service (PS) according to a unit allocation formula. A unit is equal to the average teacher's salary. While the formula itself has been explained by the Board of Education (in the annual Comparative Analysis of the Organization of the High Schools, the Fall Term), several basic questions needed to be explored:

1. What are the underlying fiscal and educational assumptions of the unit allocation formula?

2. How is the unit allocation integrated with other funds and personnel assignments at the school level?

3. How does the structure of the formula affect organization and management at the school level?

4. Is the quality and amount of educational services delivered to students affected by management practices at the Board of Education or at the individual school? Which practices should be promoted, and which should be revised?

The Panel initiated a study to answer these questions based on the following premises. First, underpinning this study is the contention that the principal should be given more flexibility in administering a school. Recent studies have emphasized the role of the principal (see Chapter VI) in establishing an effective school. We were impressed with the dedication and energy of the majority of high school principals whom we interviewed. Considering the diversity of the high school population and the variety of their special needs, creativity and innovation should be encouraged. The individual principal is best prepared to address the problems of the specific school and the Central Board should not place constraints on his or her ability to do so.

The second premise is that flexibility must be accompanied by accountability. The Board of Education should not impinge on the principal's ability to run an effective school, either as a result of policy decisions or mismanagement. However, the principal must be accountable for the decisions that he or she makes, and regularly examine the organization of the school to identify areas for improvement.

The study had two major components. The first was a statistical analysis of the actual distribution and utilization of funds for the fall terms 1975 through 1978.[1] The second part of the research design focused on interviews with personnel of the Board of Education. Interviews were conducted with a

sample consisting of eighteen high school principals,[2] the five borough superintendents or a designated representative, and numerous people at the Central Board, (including the Division of High Schools, the Office of School Safety, Division of Business and Administration, Division of Personnel, and the Office of Education Statistics).

The sample schools cover the entire spectrum of academic/comprehensive high schools and vocational/technical high schools (see Appendix I, School Profiles).

The study does not attempt to evaluate educational programs at the New York City high schools. Rather, we have identified current budgetary and management practices which interfere with the delivery of quality education within the individual school. At the same time, we are making a series of recommendations which would effectively increase the worth of the monies available to the high schools, by raising the productivity and flexibility associated with the unit allocation.

Following a discussion of the current means of allocating funds to the high schools, the report will discuss six areas demanding reform or improvements:

-- Differentiated staffing in the high schools;

-- Management practices at Central Divisions of the Board of Education;

-- Contract provisions;

-- Disincentives within the formula to improve attendance;

-- Flexibility in the expenditure of funds;

-- The equitable distribution of funds;

Finally, there will be a discussion of a proposed per capita allocation formula.

NOTES

[1] All Data was taken from the following Board of Education documents:

a) Comparative Analysis of the Organization of the High Schools, Fall Term 1975/1976/1977.
b) High School Organization Report, Parts I-IX, Fall 1978, Division of High Schools.
c) Preliminary Allotment of Budget Capabiltiy-Fall Term 1977/1978 Tax Levy Only, Division of High Schools Memo.
d) Change in 1977/1978 Fall Term Staff Unit Allotment, Division of High Schools Memo.
e) Register and Attendance-Fall Term 1977/1978, Division of High Schools Memo.
f) School Profiles, 1976-77, Office of Educational Statistics.
g) Attendance data from the Office of Educational Statistics, Computer Printouts.

[2] Alternative high schools were not included in the study. These schools currently receive funds according to a separate allocation formula. While these schools are not directly comparable with the other high schools, they merit individual study at a future time.

SUMMARY

CHAPTER I: TAX LEVY FUNDING FOR THE NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

The present allocation system, begun in the fall term, 1973, distributes tax levy funds for Personal Services in units, equal to the average teacher's salary. The units are allotted each semester to the City's ninety-nine academic/comprehensive and vocational/technical schools by a standard allocation formula. The formula has three components (pp. 1-7):

> basic support units - based on student register
>
> instruction and supervision - based on student register, the weighted daily pupil load or curriculum index, the average class size, and the maximum instructional load provided by the UFT contract.
>
> pupils with special educational needs (PSEN) - based on the percent of the student register scoring two or more years below grade level on a standardized reading test.

In addition, discrete units are distributed at the discretion of the Executive Director and borough superintendents. Finally, a budget adjustment is made for basic support and instruction and supervision. This below-the-line cut reduces the allocations to a level within the Division of High Schools' budget appropriation.

In addition, the school is given tax levy funds from three other major sources (pp. 7-10). (Custodial personnel are not included in this study). Other than Personal Services (OTPS) allotments are distributed annually in dollar amounts. School aides are allocated at the same time as the unit allotment, however, the number of aide hours is derived from a separate formula. Finally, school guards are assigned from the Office of School Safety, which has developed its own formula.

CHAPTER II: DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS

The unit allocation was an attempt to increase the options available to a principal in organizing a high school. The earlier practice of assigning positions to each school assumed that all high schools would function best according to one model, designed at the Central Board of Education. The unit allocation formula recognized the diverse needs of the City's high schools and permits the person who is most knowledgeable about each specific situation, the principal, to organize the personnel.

Differentiated staff, or the use of a variety of personnel titles, with different levels of skill and experience, is a means of taking full advantage of the unit allocation formula. In addition to assistant principals, teachers, and secretaries, aides and paraprofessionals with varying levels of training are available to the high schools. Also, certain civil service titles (p. 2) may be employed at the high schools if the principal feels this is appropriate. More effective management, as well as dollar savings, will result from imaginative use of differentiated staffing, as determined by the principal. In reviewing existing deployment practices at the high schools, we identified savings in the use of teacher time, guidance personnel, and secretaries.

Use of Teacher Time (pp. 12-17)

There are non-classroom duties in the schools which historically have been performed by teachers. The UFT contract provides two methods for assigning teachers to administrative, supervisory, or guidance duties. In addition to five instructional periods, a sixth administrative period may be assigned to all teachers without a home room, or official class, assignment, and to thirty five percent of the home room teachers. If additional teacher time is required in the schools, teachers will perform these administrative duties in lieu of teaching.

While some non-instructional duties demand a teacher's training and expertise, many of these duties could be performed by non-pedagogues. This would produce a dollar savings. In addition, certain duties, now handled during one or two periods in the middle of a teacher's busy day, could benefit by the full attention of a para, aide, or clerical personnel.

During this period of fiscal constraint in New York City, increased services can only be provided by using differentiated staffing and allowing teachers to return to the classroom. However, instructional time has not increased from the fall term 1975 to the fall term 1977 but decreased. A report by the New York City Comptroller identified tasks which could be successfully carried out by non-teachers. The savings, assuming an increase in permissible administrative time, would be 510.71 units City-wide, or $9,678,465. These units could be allocated for additional staff within the high schools (pp. 18-29).

Guidance (pp. 29-35)

Many teachers perform guidance-related duties or grade advising during administrative or in-lieu periods. According to the State Education Department all persons involved in full or part-time (even five periods per week) guidance work, must possess New York State certification. In June, 1977, eighty four percent of the guidance staff in the high schools did not have this certification.

Many high school principals are reluctant to replace those teachers who are acting as grade advisors by counselors. The major objection relates to cost. However, although guidance counselors receive a higher salary than teachers, they work a longer day. Even if paraprofessionals were hired to assist the counselors with clerical work, as much as $3,408,973 would be saved by using only full-time guidance counselors in place of teachers (based on fall 1977 data), assuming that guidance counselors provide services to students for a nine period day.

Secretaries (pp. 35-37)

Another way of increasing a principal's options and flexibility in staffing is to increase the number of available job titles. School secretaries must have at least two years of college, two years experience and excellent typing and stenography skills. However, in our discussions with principals, it appears that only three or four secretaries take dictation as part of their regular duties while schools have as many as 15 secretaries. With this in mind, it would appear to be cost-effective to have a second secretarial title requiring less skills

and experience. If each school replaced all but four of their secretaries with this second title, as much as $2,267,297 would be available for reallocation (using fall, 1977 data and salaries of $12,096 and $8,000).

Recommendations

1) All principals should:

 a. Examine administrative assignments to ensure that all available administrative periods have been utilized before "in-lieu" assignments are made.

 b. Examine administrative assignments to determine where non-teachers could be used effectively.

 c. Organize guidance services to maximize the use of full-time counselors and clerical staff, where appropriate.

2) A second level of secretary should be created for those positions which don't demand stenographic skills.

CHAPTER III - MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AT CENTRAL DIVISIONS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Many of the problems faced by high school principals are the result of actions taken by the Division of High Schools and other units of the Board of Education.

Bureau of Supplies (pp. 39-42)

In the course of interviewing eighteen principals, there was unanimous agreement that there are insufficient OTPS funds. However, this problem is compounded by problems at the Bureau of Supplies. Mismanagement at the Bureau of Supplies, examined by EPP in its "Management Study of Bidding and Purchasing" (May 31, 1978) costs the City $15 million annually (out of $150 million in purchases). This means that each high school loses the value of ten percent of its OTPS allocation due to errors at BOS.

In light of this, many principals feel that they could purchase quality merchandise themselves at a significant savings in time and money.

BOS is undergoing a major re-organization. In addition to new internal management and information practices, a training program has been organized for assistant stockmen at the high schools. These are encouraging steps which will be monitored.

Division of High Schools OTPS Office (pp. 42-44)

Additional difficulties occur with the OTPS funds for the high schools

because of the nature of the central OTPS office. This office serves to hand out the OTPS allocations and to place the orders from the high schools with either the Bureau of Supplies or the vendors. Currently, it does not appear to do either task with great efficiency.

Basically, once a school's allotment is computed by the formula, the allocating of OTPS funds is straightforward, and should be accomplished with little difficulty. However, there are repeated delays which postpone the actual allocation to the schools. While the allocations for Personal Services for the spring semester were handed out before Christmas, 1978, the annual OTPS funds for the school year starting in September had not been given out as of January 4, 1979. We understand that plans do exist to distribute the annual OTPS allocation at the same time as the fall unit allocation.

The OTPS office also places orders for supplies for the high schools, sometimes providing an additional opportunity for errors in the ordering. It has also been noted that for the 1978-79 school year, 43.65% of the OTPS funds were administered centrally. More items could be included in the general allocation to the schools, such as postage and student activities, once again increasing the principals' flexibility in spending.

We have learned that this office has recently undergone some changes.

Register Estimates for the Unit Allocation (pp. 46-51)

The unit allocation for the fall semester is based on the estimated register computed in May or June of the previous school year. It is important for the schools to be as accurate as possible in their estimate to ensure that accurate allocations can be made. Penalties are handed out for overestimating the register by more than two percent, and by underestimating by more than this amount, the school generally loses units that might otherwise have been a part of the amount allocated. (If there is a substantial underestimate, the school may be awarded a unit in the fall, at the price of major rescheduling and disruption for staff and students).

Several problems are generated by this process. Certain schools may tend to overestimate continually, knowing that they will be able to plead hardship and avoid the set penalties. Other schools are entitled to additional units in the fall either because they were too conservative, unexpected zoning decisions affected enrollment, the number of incoming students did not follow recent trends, or they were given inaccurate information by the feeder schools or the Office of Zoning and Integration. However, there are rescheduling problems and the possibility that the position will not be filled once the semester has begun. Finally, the Division may alter a principal's estimate, based on their own expectations. However, if they are wrong, the school may suffer from an error by staff at the Division of High Schools.

High School Application Process (pp. 52-55)

There are several types of high schools and specific programs that require an entrance examination. A standardized test (possibly including an additional aptitude section required by schools such as Aviation) would mean that a student would only take one test and only one test would be graded. This could not apply to shoe schools which rely on auditions or screenings. The student

applying to several schools would only have to be notified once. This would eliminate the possibility of repeated rejections, providing a more positive support of the student's initiation into high school.

This could also eliminate the problem of multiple acceptances. A student would not need to accept at a "safe school", confusing high school registers.

Allocation of Discrete Units to High Schools (pp. 56-60)

Additional discrete units, distributed by the Executive Director, Division of High Schools and borough superintendents for special needs, can provide the capacity for innovative programs or for solving specific problems. There is evidence of a review process by the Office of the Executive Director, evaluating requests for new units and monitoring the use of prior funding. However, the borough superintendents had no formal mechanisms for monitoring these funds or reviewing requests.

Office of High School Projects, Division of High Schools (pp. 61-63)

In this time of fiscal crisis, many of the schools are looking to other sources for funding. Although these funds are not a part of the unit allocation formula, they allow the principal additional flexibility in using the allocated units. Therefore, we would like to encourage the search for these funds, and point out the assistance available at the Central Division of High Schools in funding monies, especially noteworthy are the competitive grants which are not related to income level.

Librarians (pp. 63-64)

New York State has strict requirements regarding the number of librarians in a high school, based on the number of students. However, the question arises as to whether the State requirement is too rigid, and whether other considerations besides the register of the school should be used to indicate library staffing needs.

We recommend that the State mandate be altered to better reflect the potential utilization of the library for each school. Rather than using the size of the student body, we suggest that the physical size of the library, its current use, or the number of courses in a school requiring library work be factors in requiring specific numbers of certified librarians, possibly assisted by paras. We certainly encourage the increased usage of the library and reference materials by all the high school students but feel that, with the current budget restrictions already limiting the resources available, the emphasis should be on teachers who can spend time in the classroom, and this requirement reduces the units available for classroom teachers for some schools.

Recommendations

1) High Schools should take advantage of the Bureau of Supplies' training program for assistant stockmen.

2) High schools should place orders for supplies directly with the Bureau of Supplies. A pilot program should be set up which would allow a principal expanded purchasing power.

3) The OTPS Office at the Division of High Schools should be absorbed by the office which distributes the unit allocation.

4) The OTPS allotment should be given out bi-annually, in order to adjust for possible surpluses.

5) Feeder schools and the Office of Zoning and Integration must provide accurate register information to the high schools.

6) A school should be required to establish that an overestimate was due to circumstances beyond its control or to misinformation from the Board of Education, or else be forced to pay the full penalty, regardless of size.

7) Principals should have the option of deciding whether they want to accept a unit after the start of the semester, or have it credited to the second semester.

8) The principal, who will have to accommodate for any mistakes, should have the final say regarding the estimate.

9) The high school application procedure should be standardized so that there is a single entrance examination and a single notification process. The model of the City University of New York's Office of Admissions should be examined.

10) Discrete units, distributed at the discretion of the executive director and borough superintendents, should be contingent on a precise strategy for accomplishing specified objectives and a formal evaluation procedure.

11) The state mandates regarding school librarians should be re-examined.

CHAPTER IV: CONTRACT PROVISIONS

It is not the purpose of this study to examine the UFT contract and its provisions. However, we feel that because these contractual restrictions do affect the use of units in the allocation formula, a brief discussion is in order. Also, our interviews with the principals indicated that the contract provides restrictions on managing their schools, in addition to the imposed budget constraints. An increased flexibility in these areas would increase a principal's capacity to address the needs of the student body.

Class Size (pp. 67-70)

An arbitrary limit is set on class size by the contract. However, for

the fall term, 1977, thirty one percent of the classes exceeded this ceiling due to various authorized exemptions. Class size should be determined by the principal and the pedagogic staff based on the specific student body, staff, and course offerings.

Preparation Periods (pp. 70-71)

In light of the many restrictions on the use of preparation periods, these often become free periods for teachers. If one preparation period each week could be made available for assignments aimed at improving intra- and inter-school communication, staff development, or experimentation, productivity could be increased at no cost and with little effort.

Thirty five percent Rule and Additional Work Days (pp. 71-72)

If all teachers could be assigned administrative assignments, abolishing the thirty five percent rule, there would be an estimated savings of $15 million.

Home room may offer an opportunity to establish personal contact with a student and demonstrate that someone is aware and concerned about the student's attendance. This is discouraged by the fact that home room teachers no longer send post cards to the families of absentees. Certain principals referred to the difficulty of preparing for the opening of the school year with little assistance and much last minute information. As much as $41 million would be gained in productivity if teachers were available for three days prior to the opening of school, one day at the close, and available to students after school for only five hours per week.

Seniority and Rotation of Assignments (pp. 72-73)

Seniority should be a consideration, but not a determinant of teacher assignment. The senior teacher is not predictably the most effective member of the staff. Therefore, the use of seniority as a basis for assignment has a somewhat random effect on the quality of education. Course offerings are also affected, as programs must be dropped because the teacher is excessed according to seniority. Course offerings are also affected by the requirement to rotate assignments to official classes, special and honor classes, and auxiliary buildings. Teachers with specific experiences who start programs have to be rotated out of those assignments after a fixed period of time, often leading to the dismantling of the program.

Recommendation

The UFT contract should be given careful scrutiny before the next round of contract negotiations. Suggested areas for revision include:

a) maximum class size;
b) use of preparation periods;
c) thirty five percent rule;
d) rotation of duties;
e) responsibilities of home room teachers.

CHAPTER V: DISINCENTIVES WITHIN THE FORMULA TO IMPROVE ATTENDANCE

Currently, attendance is given consideration in the unit allocation formula with the exclusion of long-term absentees. Long-term absentees (LTA's) are those students who have not attended school any day during the first two months of any given semester. "Adjusted register" refers to the fact that these students are not included in the register for allocation purposes.

There are two ways in which the formula provides disincentives to increasing attendance (pp. 79-81).

1. There are truant students included on the adjusted audited register and funds are allotted for their education and they are not provided with classroom services. In Fall, 1978, 928 students who were not LTA's were not enrolled in subject classes.

In addition, for those students not included on the register for allocation purposes, there is no fiscal incentive to bring an LTA back into the school system. Since no funds are provided for LTA's, if an LTA student does return and services are provided, either guidance or instruction, this is not reflected in the allocation fromula until the following semester. These services must be taken from the limited units provided for those students on the register. One cannot expect the schools to do anything for their LTA's unless they're given specific funding.

2. Most students with attendance problems are not LTA's, but rather students who either attend several times a week, but not regularly, or do not attend all of their classes daily. Of forty students registered for a class, thirty may attend daily, however, there is a different mix of students each day.

Class-size grievances are settled on the basis of "live bodies." A high truancy rate may offer a principal an answer to the combined pressures of a restricted budget and a rigorous teacher contract. There is no fiscal incentive to increase class attendance to the point at which more classes would be required, without a similar increase in funds. There are students with so-called "paper schedules," who are enrolled in grossly oversized classes with the assumption that they will not attend, an assumption that may be self-fulfilling. Students who already have an attendance problem are likely to respond by continuing to absent themselves.

Two proposals to provide incentives to increase attendance have been analyzed.

1) The specialized high schools (Stuyvesant, Music and Art, Performing Arts, Bronx Science, Brooklyn Tech) proposed that attendance should be used as a basis for receiving additional units (pp. 85-91). They proposed a change because the allotment formula does not take attendance into account, dollars per pupil attending is less in schools with high attendance. The gap is further widened.

by the PSEN and reimbursable programs, and the instructional needs for small classes and added guidance needs in the special schools should be taken into account. (See Appendix III, Reimbursable Positions.)

A detailed analysis demonstrated that:

1) The formula does consider attendance by discounting LTA's;

2) An analysis of the per capita allocations for each school shows that the specialized schools receive more than the average per capita allocation;

3) PSEN and Title I funds have been designated, by legislation, as supplemental funds for those students who need additional resources in order to achieve a minimum level of skills. These funds may not be used to supplant or replace tax levy funds.

4) The Special High Schools feel that some consideration should be given to their needs for smaller classes and additional guidance services. All students have the same worth in human terms, and a small class which provides remediation to students with special needs is as important as a high level language or math class, which is "expensive" because only a handful of students qualify. Likewise, the need for special college counseling is balanced by the counseling needs of other students who may have specific social problems.

2) The High School Principals Association also presented a proposal (pp. 91-99) which would award schools for increasing attendance and level sanctions against schools with declining attendance. The proposal was analyzed on the assumption that no new funds would be available for attendance purposes.

3) The analysis established that the changes would be minimal, based on the necessary below-the-line cut to fund the additional units for attendance incentives, and that those schools which have a decreasing attendance lose twice: once for the below-the-line cuts and then again as a penalty. This This could be particularly hard on a school in a transitional neighborhood, declining attendance is not primarily school related.

Recommendations

1) The allocation formula, whatever its form, should be considered to be child-specific funds. While different services may be provided to different students, a student must receive services in return for the funding that he/she attracts to the schools. If a full instructional load is inappropriate for a student, alternative supportive services should be offered. Under no circumstances should one student's program depend on the absence of another. The evaluation and monitoring of such a targeting of funds should be a part of the task performed by the borough superintendents in supervising all principals.

2) A certain number of Executive Director's discretionary units should be reserved for attendance purposes. A number of these would be assigned, on a per capita basis, to the schools for their LTA's. The amount would be less than that for students on the allocation register, so that there would be an incentive to succeed in bringing long-term truants back to the schools, at which time the schools would be awarded a higher allocation.

3) Attendance should always be a priority, especially if any new funding is made available to the Division of High Schools, from management changes, declining enrollment, or reallocations.

CHAPTER VI: FLEXIBILITY IN THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS

Although the unit allocation formula, rather than allotment by positions, provides a principal with additional personnel options, the principal should be given more flexibility in running the schools. This is based on the premise that the principal is best acquainted with the specific staff and student body and plays a crucial role as educational leader of the school.

Chapter I describes the several layers of funding which enter an individual high schools. The unit allocation, OTPS money, school aide hours, and school guards are all allotted by different methods, accompanied by varying restrictions. The resulting web limits the principal's options in three ways.

1) The categorical nature of the funding (pp. 104-5);

2) Disincentives to cost-effectiveness and (pp. 105-6);

3) Components of the formula (pp. 106-110).

Categorical funding, useful for accountability purposes, are counterproductive if the money can only be used for services that are not required. For example, units can be converted to school aid hours, but hours cannot be converted into units if the principal deems this necessary.

If savings cannot be converted to other uses, there is no reason to accrue savings. For example, if the number of serious incidents are reduced in a school by effective use of aides and teachers, the school receives less school guards. If the school is not able to re-allocate the savings, there is no fiscal incentive to improve. School guards present a specific problem because they are assigned and evaluated by the Office of School Safety, fragmenting authority at the school level.

The third restriction on flexibility is a result of the structure of the unit allocation formula, specifically the dependence on the curriculum index to determine instructional units. For example, a principal may find that, fortunately, after organizing the school's personnel, there is one unit still available. If this unit is used to hire an additional teacher who will teach five classes of maximum size daily, the school's curriculum index would be increased enough to yield an additional 1.13 units the next year. However, the principal may feel that the student body would receive more benefit if class size were reduced. Using the additional unit for a teacher who would teach five classes of twenty-five students each, allowing all other classes in that department to be reduced in size comparably, would have no fiscal reward.

Additional guidance, security, educational assistants in the classroom, or additional classroom supplies would also be "expensive" uses for the unit, yielding no future financial return. Obviously, the formula supplies motivation for making certain educational decisions. Due to budget limitations, the high schools cannot offer both small classes and a wide range of course offerings in a long school day. However, the choice should be based on the appropriate educational program for a specific child.

Recommendations

1) School aide hours and OTPS funds should be incorporated within the unit allocation formula.

2) The current administration of school guards by the Office of School Safety should be examined. School guards should be incorporated within the unit allocation formula also after provision is made for the borough-wide mobile forces.

3) Borough superintendents should monitor the use of units in schools to encourage improved education.

CHAPTER VII: EQUITY IN THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

The final question to be addressed by this study concerns the equitable distribution of funds. One of the basic advantages of any allocation formula is its objectivity. A formula is supposedly blind to any special interests, distributing funds without acknowledging any outside pressures. Every student should be able to expect that the New York City Board of Education has given each child's education an equal priority. If instruction is to be individualized to meet the needs of each child, programs will be as varied as the student population. However, no child should be penalized because he or she attends a school that receives less funding than another.

The weight of the curriculum index (pp. 113-117) in the formula affects the equitable distribution of funds. If a school wishes to increase its curriculum index, this must be done out of existing funds. The allocation for the next term will then increase, reflecting a higher index. While a school may request funding for this higher index, only small increments will be funded in advance, for "each principal's original estimate is reviewed, and, if necessary, adjusted according to experience."

Equity does not mean that exactly the same amount of money must be psent on every child. Just as additional PSEN units are allocated for students with special needs, other schools demand additional units in order to provide the special programs that they promise. Vocational schools have unique funding requirements in order to meet their mandates. The special high schools also have a commitment to the gifted and talented students that must be met. However, this should be the primary role fo the discrete units, to fund a school's special programs.

The present structure of the formula, based on the curriculum index, means that those schools which have offered more courses to the students in the past will be given the resources to continue to do so. Likewise, those schools which offer fewer courses will be maintained at the same level of funding, unless the school can manage to increase the daily pupil load without additional resources. For Fall 1978, per capita allocations ranged from 1 unit for every 14.78 students to 1 unit for every 27.26 students (based on adjusted audited registers) (pp. 117-126).

If the argument is presented that different course loads are appropriate for different students, it would appear that the same would hold true for the number of basic support units required by different student bodies. While one group of students may not be capable of successfully completing 7 academic subjects, it may be that they require additional guidance, individual tutorials, or the services of a family para. However, while the school receives fewer instructional units based on the specific educational program of the school, basic support units are only affected by the size of the register. Basic support units do not vary according to the specific educational program in order to provide the kind of additional

support services noted above. The choice is, either both components of the formula (basic support and instructional supervision) should consider the relative needs of each student body; or the formula should allocate funds on a strict per capita basis, relying upon discrete units to fund special programs. The final chapter presents our recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION

CHAPTER VII: PROPOSED PER CAPITA ALLOCATION

The Educational Priorities Panel recommends that the unit allocation formula be revised to provide an equitable distribution of tax levy funds to the high schools. In accomplishing this revision in the formula, no single high school should be hurt, since every school has sustained repeated budget cuts for the past four years. This recommendation can only be implemented with the necessary additional funds, or phased in gradually.

In this and previous studies, the Educational Priorities Panel has identified areas of waste and mismanagement at the Board of Education. The Panel has been instrumental, through its recommendations and testimony, in achieving the reallocation of $83 million into instructional areas over the last 3 years. The Community School Districts and the Department of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services have enjoyed the benefits of all of this money (for transitional classes, reduced class size in the first grade, etc.). In fact, the only instructional program that has not yet received a major reallocation of funds is the high schools. The Panel has identified the high schools as a priority for any funds which become available through management savings. From this perspective, we feel that it is consistent with our position to request additional funds in order to provide equity and improved education for all New York City high school students.

We recommend a per capita allocation, incorporating school aide hours and OTPS funds as suggested in Chapter VI. A per capita allocation would both provide a more equitable allocation and allow the principal complete flexibility in designing an educational program. Units would not be earmarked for any specific positions, but would be targeted to ensure that services were provided to every student on the register, as noted in the recommendations on attendance. Equity does not mean that each student would benefit from, or should receive, identical services. A per capita allocation would be equitable with the flexibility to provide appropriate services (pp. 129-243), overcoming the problems caused by the present dependence on the curriculum index.

Because of the range, at present, in both the curriculum index and per capita distribution of funds for the different schools, any revision in the formula would, necessarily, help some schools and hurt others. Repeated cuts in the budget of the Division of High Schools, appearing as a budget adjustment or below-the-line cut for each school, mean that all of the high schools

continue to operate under severe fiscal constraints. None of these schools can afford substantial reductions in funding. Our recommendation is to upgrade those schools which have been penalized under the current formula. In order to ensure that no school suffers, an additional 508.56 units or $9,636,720 is required to institute a per capita allocation. These funds would insure that no school's allocation would drop from its current level as a result of a per capita shift.

It should also be noted that an inequity exists state-wide regarding vocational schools, which might be exacerbated by a shift to a per capita allocation. If BOCES funds, currently reserved for non New York City school districts, were made available to New York City as well, the special needs of vocational education could be funded, lending impetus to the recommended shift to a per capita allocation.

Our recommendation is premised on the right of every student to a minimum level of educational services.

CHAPTER I

TAX LEVY FUNDING FOR THE NEW YORK CITY HIGH SCHOOLS

A high school currently receives tax levy funds in a complex manner. Funding comes from several sources, as either units, hours of staff time, staff positions, or dollars. There are also various restrictions on the use of funds, and whether they can be converted to other purposes. The greatest portion of this funding is distributed according to the unit allocation formula. In addition, the school is given funds from three other major sources. (Custodial personnel are not included in this study, nor are reimbursable positions.) Other Than Personal Services (OTPS) allotments are distributed annually in dollar amounts. School aides are allocated at the same time as the unit allotment, however, the number of aide hours is derived from a separate formula. Finally, school guards are assigned from the Office of School Safety, which has developed its own formula. It is necessary to understand this complex web and the underlying assumptions in order to evaluate the administration of these funds.

I. THE UNIT ALLOCATION FORMULA

The unit allocation formula allots tax-levy funds for Personal Services (PS) by semester. A standard formula is used for all academic/comprehensive and vocational/technical high schools (alternative schools have a separate funding formula). This formula was first instituted for the Fall term 1973, to replace an earlier allocation method which was based on positions. Previously, each school was allotted a certain number of assistant principals, guidance counselors, teachers, secretaries, etc. The only decision reserved for the principal was the

distribution of teachers among license areas. The unit formula allows the principal to determine the number of staff members in each staff category and to convert any amount of units for non-teaching positions.

A unit for one semester is equal in value to one half the average teacher's salary (½ of $18,951 for the 1978-79 school year). The unit worth of all other staff positions is determined by the ratio of the average salary for that position to the average teachers salary. The following personnel may be funded from a school's unit allocation. The unit worth, or "cost," of each position is listed below. The principal may organize the school at his or her discretion, with the single restriction being the total number of units available for each school.

TABLE 1 -- UNIT WORTH OF POSITIONS - FALL, 1978

PEDAGOGIC POSITIONS

Principal	1.81	Industrial Arts Technician	0.53
Assistant Principal	1.34	Laboratory Specialist	0.79
Guidance Counselor	1.14	Laboratory Technician	0.54
Teacher	1.00	School Secretary	0.63
		Sub. School Secretary Interne	0.38

NON-PEDAGOGIC (CIVIL SERVICE) POSITIONS

Administrative Assistant EDP	0.67	Machinist Helper	0.97
Assistant Stockman	0.47	School Neighborhood Worker	0.48
Audio-Visual Technician	0.59	School Neigh. Worker Sr.	0.59
Dental Hygienist	0.56	School Neigh. Worker(Principal)	0.68

PARA-PROFESSIONAL HOURLY EMPLOYEES[1]

	Unit Per Hour		
School Aide	0.000526	Family Para	0.000603
Educational Para	0.000600	Parent Program Ass't	0.000777
Auxiliary Trainer	0.000764	Student Aide	0.000261

PER-SESSION PERSONNEL

Extracurricular (per hour)	0.0014
Peak Load School Secretary (per day)	0.0033

The units are allocated according to a prescribed formula. Before the units are distributed among the schools, funds are reserved for specific centrally-administered services. These include:

1) Sabbaticals
2) Substitute service for absentees
3) Vacation, holiday, and sick pay (Compensated sick leave hours for school aides and para-professionals are deducted from a school's hourly budget.)
4) Discrete units allocated at the discretion of the executive director and borough superintendents to meet schools' requests for optional or innovative programs (4-5% of the number of units allocated by formula). This includes allocations for language handicap programs in accordance with the consent decree.
5) Miscellaneous needs, including such city-wide services as admissions tests, or the special remediation funds which were distributed by the executive director as discrete units for Fall, 1978.
6) Reserve units for unanticipated register increases (30-35 units for the Fall semester).

The unit allocation formula is based on the pupil register, the percent of pupils reading two or more years below grade level, the weighted daily pupil load or curriculum index, and the average class size.

A. REGISTER

The register is the adjusted audited register estimated for October 31 for the Fall term allotment or March 31 for the Spring term. The estimate is made by the principal during the preceding term.

"Adjusted" refers to the removal of all Long Term Absentees from the register for allocation purposes. These are students that have been absent every day for the first two months of the term.

The principal's estimate may be revised after negotiations in order to make it consistent with past experience and the latest information on incoming students. The actual register audited as of October 31 or March 31 is compared to the final estimate. The school is penalized for overestimating by more than 2%. One unit is deducted from the next term's allocation for every additional unit received by the school for overestimating. A school may also receive additional units at the beginning of the term to provide for unexpected register increases (see #6 above).

B. PUPILS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (PSEN)

These are students who are two or more years below grade level for reading. They are identified by a standardized reading test. Students excused from the examination because of language handicaps are included in the PSEN population and provision is made for students who are absent on the day of the exam.

C. WEIGHTED DAILY PUPIL LOAD/CURRICULUM INDEX

The weighted daily pupil load is the average daily number of subjects taken by students, weighted for contractual class size maximums. The allocation is made with reference to the principal's estimate, which is adjusted to reflect experience.

The weighting is based on the normal contractual maximum class size of 34.

Maximum Class Size	Subject Area	Computation of Weighting Used	Weighted Load Factor (See Note)
50	Physical Education	34 ÷ 50 = 0.68	0.68xA
50	Minor Music	34 ÷ 50 = 0.68	0.68xB
28	Trade Shop and Practical Arts	34 ÷ 28.= 1.22	1.22xC
34	All Other Students	34 ÷ 34 = 1.00	1.00xD

Weighted Load Factor = 0.68xA + 0.68xB + 1.22xC + 1.00xD

A,B,C, and D must be replaced with the average number of sujbects taken by pupils each day, in the subject area. In this report, "curriculum index," a term which is also used at the Division of High Schools, has been adopted for simplicity.

D. AVERAGE CLASS SIZE

The 1974-75 average class size of 31.5 is used. This is computed originally as follows:

$$31.5 = \frac{1.05 \times \text{City-wide Register, (10/74)} \times \text{Ave. curriculum Index (10/74)}}{5 \times \text{Total Staff Units for Instruction (10/74)}}$$

The formula itself has three components - basic support services, instruction and supervision, and the allotment for Pupils with Special Educational Needs (PSEN) - which are computed on the basis of the four factors explained above.

A. BASIC SUPPORT SERVICES

These units are allotted according to register. There is a minimum allocation of twenty units (for the principal and other non-teacher support positions required by a school). If the school's register exceeds 1,000 students, there is an additional 0.008 units allocated for every additional student, up to a maximum of fifty-five units.

UNITS FOR BASIC SUPPORT SERVICES = 20 + (0.008 x (register - 1,000))

B. INSTRUCTION AND SUPERVISION

Units for instruction and supervision are distributed on the basis that each teacher will teach five periods per day, as provided by contract, and that the average class size is 31.5. A factor of 1.05 is used to provide for the salary differential for Assistant Principals-Supervision, who are required to teach at least two periods daily. Sufficient units are allocated to ensure that each student receives the number of instructional periods determined by the curriculum index. In other words, funding is provided to maintain a specific curriculum index at each school, establishing an instructional day that varies from school to school.

$$\text{UNITS FOR INSTRUCTION + SUPERVISION} = \frac{1.05 \times \text{REGISTER} \times \text{CURRICULUM INDEX}}{5 \times 31.5}$$

C. ALLOTMENT FOR PUPILS WITH SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS (PSEN)

These are State funds which are allocated for instruction in remedial reading and mathematics or remediation through bi-lingual methodology.

The number of pupils targeted to receive this aid is computed by multiplying the percent of the student body who were identified by the standardized reading test, times the estimated register. The total amount of units available to the New York City High Schools for PSEN is divided by the number of Pupils with Special Educational Needs in order to obtain a per capita allocation. Each school receives the appropriate allocation, rounded to the nearest 0.20.

$$\text{PER CAPITA ALLOCATION} = \frac{\text{PSEN UNITS AVAILABLE CITY-WIDE}}{\text{\# PSEN PUPILS CITY-WIDE}}$$

UNITS FOR PSEN = PER CAPITA ALLOCATION x SCHOOL REGISTER x % PSEN
(For fall, 1978, the per capita allocation for PSEN was 0.006098).

A school's allocation is the sum of these three components plus any discrete units allotted by the Executive Director or borough superintendent (See #4 above).

Finally, if the number of units required by the formula exceeds the number of available units, a budget adjustment must be made. A percent reduction is made as a below-the-line cut to meet the budget capability. Only basic support services and instruction and supervision are affected by this cut. There is no budget adjustment for PSEN or discrete units.

II. SCHOOL AIDE HOURS

The formula for school aides is based on the following factors:

1) Register
2) Number of Pupils with Special Educational Needs
3) Number of periods per day, reflecting the length of time the school is open daily
4) Number of buildings

School aides (hourly employees) are allocated to the schools, each semester, as a number of available hours. The formula for fall, 1978, had the following three components:

A) BASE HOURS

125 x No. of periods + 0.9031 x Register

(0.9031 is a per capita allocation computed by dividing the total available hours by the city-wide weighted pupil register).

B) SUPPORT HOURS

0.9031 x (0.25 x ESTIMATED RETARDED READERS)

C) ANNEX SUPPLEMENT

500 HOURS

III. SCHOOL GUARD - OFFICE OF SCHOOL SAFETY

The Office of School Safety has a budget capacity for a set number of school guards in the high schools. Funds are allocated for a set number of guards. Sixty percent of the available guards are divided among the one hundred high schools, giving each an equal number of guards. Thirty-five percent of the available guards are allocated to the schools on the basis of the number of incidents reported such as assault, robbery, sex offenses, narcotics or possession of weapons. The remaining five percent are divided up between those schools with large registers. There are three mobile task forces in each borough with five members for each, which are assigned on reported incidents the previous year to a base school, and who then respond to needs within the borough as they arise.

IV. OTHER THAN PERSONAL SERVICES (OTPS)

OTPS funds are distributed annually. In the past they have been allocated on the basis of adjusted audited registers. This meant that allocations could not be made until after October 31 of the school year. In the future OTPS funds will be distributed at the same time as the fall term unit allocation, based on the previous year's register. Provision will be made to revise the allocation for any school that undergoes a major change in register from one year to the next.

There is a base OTPS allocation for General Educational Supplies, provisions for special classroom needs, and allotments for non-classroom supplies.

A. GENERAL EDUCATIONAL SUPPLIES - CLASSROOM

$$\frac{\text{CURRICULUM INDEX}}{5} \times \text{REGISTER} \times \$2.50$$

B. ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS FOR SPECIAL CLASSES

1)	Food Classes	
	Kitchen Supplies	$ 75.00 flat rate
	Food Perishables	5.00 per capita
2)	Clothing and Textiles Classes	2.50 per capita
3)	Family Living Classes	
	Apartment Supplies	25.00 flat rate
	Supplies	1.00 per capita
4)	Home Nursing and Nurses Aides Classes	2.00 per capita
	Food Perishables for 100 students	0.50 per capita
	100 to 300 students	0.25 per capita
	more than 300 students	0.125 per capita
5)	Industrial, Vocational, Practial	
	Arts Classes	4.30 per capita
6)	Transportation Shops	3.30 per capita
7)	Drafting Classes	2.30 per capita
8)	Driver Education	1,000.00 flat rate

There is a per capita allotment for nine different categories of supplies, equipment, and furniture. There are also additional

flat fees for mini-schools, computer maintenance (developed by the Bureau of Mathematics) and musical instruments (developed by the Bureau of Music).

The final allocation for a school is the sum of all of these discrete allotments. A budget adjustment is made if the total amount required by the formula exceeds the available funds. The below-the-line cut for 1978-79 was 34%.

CHAPTER II

DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS

A basic premis of the unit allocation formula is that the principal should be extended the capacity to use differentiated staffing. This refers to the organization of a diverse staff, encompassing personnel with varying levels of training and experience. Earlier allocations, based on positions, had forced principals to assign all duties to the standard pedagogical staff, regardless of the appropriateness of the task. Highly trained teachers, who are now receiving salaries that are commenserate with their level of education and experience, were assigned administrative duties of a clerical nature. The unit allocation would provide a principal with the opportunity to hire appropriate staff for all of the various functions within the school, including hourly employees or civil servants, rather than restricting the staff to a limited number of positions.

The ultimate aim of differentiated staffing is to increase productivity. Teachers would be free to spend all available time in the classroom, ensuring that their expertise is not wasted. Many duties (clerical work, hall patrol, etc.) could be accomplished by lower-paid personnel. There are additional benefits from assigning these tasks to full-time personnel who would not be interrupted by other concerns or time limitations.

Staffing decisions must be the responsibility of the principal, based on the specific job description. There remain many out-of-classroom duties which demand the specific skills of a teacher, such as curriculum development. Also, certain assignments may merit a teacher in one school while being adequately performed by a para in another school, with a different student population. Attendance office duties may be clerical or they may demand the skills of a school neighborhood worker. We would not dictate rigid personnel assignments to principals, for this would negate the flexibility and possibilities of the unit allocation formula. However, it appears that schools have not taken sufficient advantage of these possibilities, and we would like to highlight areas in which more appropriate staffing could make funds available for increased services to the students.

I. USE OF TEACHER TIME

Aside from actually increasing the number of teachers in the classroom, additional classroom services can be offered if one can use differentiated staffing to insure that as much teacher time as possible is spent within the classroom. Non-teaching duties performed during administrative or in lieu periods that do not require the expertise of teachers should be assigned to non-pedagogical personnel.

Recent studies have been done of the use of teacher time both by the Office of the Comptroller of New York City and by the Citizens Budget Commission, and we would like to expand on their findings. In examining the percentage use of teacher time for instruction, Table 1 shows that instructional time has decreased from the fall of 1975 (87.54%) to the fall of 1977 (87.25%), based on five periods of teaching in a day. Other findings are that:

-- Fifty-eight schools had a decrease in percent teacher time;

-- Thirty-nine schools had an increase in percent teacher time; and

-- Two schools remained stable.

At a period of fiscal crisis when teacher in class time should be at a premium, a stronger effort should be made to increase teacher time to the maximum, still remaining within the constraints of the contract.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 on percent teacher time show the number of teachers and periods spent on organization and administration, supervision and curriculum, and guidance.

TABLE 1

% USE OF TEACHER TIME

INSTRUCTION

	All Schools			Academic/Comprehensive			Vocational		
	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-
Manhattan	86.19	85.70	-.5[1]	85.20	84.90	-.37[1]	87.36	86.70	-.66
Brooklyn	87.05	86.80	-.25	87.03	86.99	-.04	87.11	86.30	-.81
Bronx*	88.05	87.60	-.45	88.18	87.32	-.86	87.60	88.50	+.90
Queens	89.11	89.00	-.11	89.10	88.59	-.51	89.20	91.73	+2.53
Staten Island	87.35	87.33	-.02	87.50	87.50	0	86.60	86.50	-.10
All Schools	87.54	87.25	-.29	87.56	87.20	-.36	87.49	87.41	-.08

*Does not include South Bronx High School.

[1] Error due to rounding.

TABLE 2

% USE OF TEACHER TIME

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

	All Schools			Academic/Comprehensive			Vocational		
	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-
Manhattan	3.79	5.02	+1.23	3.75	4.87	+1.12	3.83	5.20	+1.37
Brooklyn	2.95	3.02	+.08[1]	2.52	2.90	+.38	4.08	3.36	-.72
Bronx*	2.69	2.77	+.08	2.17	2.46	+.29	4.38	3.78	-.60
Queens	2.40	2.31	-.10[1]	2.21	2.13	-.08	3.70	3.50	-.20
Staten Island	2.70	2.58	-.12	2.42	2.60	+.18	4.10	2.50	-1.60
All Schools	2.93	3.19	+.26	2.55	2.89	+.33[1]	4.00	4.04	+.05[1]

*Does not include South Bronx High School.

[1]Error due to rounding.

TABLE 3

% USE OF TEACHER TIME

SUPERVISION AND CURRICULUM

(Includes contractually required supervisory time for Assistant Principals - Supervision)

	All Schools			Academic/Comprehensive			Vocational		
	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-
Manhattan	4.14	3.91	-.24[1]	4.33	4.33	0	3.91	3.39	-.52
Brooklyn	4.03	4.16	+.13	4.13	3.98	-.15	3.76	4.63	+.87[1]
Bronx*	3.49	3.97	+.48	3.73	4.15	+.42	2.70	3.40	+.70
Queens	3.29	3.59	+.30	3.33	3.82	+.49	3.00	2.10	-.90
Staten Island	3.52	3.35	-.17	3.52	3.40	-.12	3.50	3.10	-.40
All Schools	3.76	3.89	+.14[1]	3.83	3.98	+.15	3.55	3.66	+.11

*Does not include South Bronx High School.

[1]Error due to rounding.

TABLE 4

% USE OF TEACHER TIME

GUIDANCE

(Does not include Guidance Counselors)

	All Schools			Academic/Comprehensive			Vocational		
	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-	Fall 1975	Fall 1977	Avg. +/-
Manhattan	5.89	5.37	-.52	6.68	5.92	-.76	4.91	4.69	-.22
Brooklyn	5.97	6.00	+.03	6.32	6.12	-.20	5.03	5.67	+.64
Bronx*	5.79	5.64	-.15	5.91	6.06	+.15	5.38	4.28	-1.10
Queens	5.21	5.09	-.12	5.37	5.46	+.09	4.13	2.63	-1.50
Staten Island	6.40	6.72	+.32	6.50	6.48	-.02	5.90	7.90	+2.00
All Schools	5.77	5.64	-.13	6.05	5.92	-.13	4.97	4.85	-.12

*Does not include South Bronx High School.

II. USES OF DIFFERENTIAL STAFFING

Differentiated staffing can provide additional savings and flexibility if used by the principals to the greatest extent possible. In this regard, we recommend that the principals carefully examine the varied uses of paraprofessionals and school aides to determine if an increased use of these non-pedagogues would be advantageous to them in running their schools.

There are basically three types of non-pedagogues in the high schools: School aides, paraprofessionals, and secretaries. School aides are used as auxiliary security guards, for some clerical work, to monitor the lunchrooms and to run errands. In one school, the aide is used as a bookkeeper and in others they issue bus passes, collect milk money, and do some of the tasks involved in programming. There are three salary levels for aides, but these are based on when the aide was in service, and what salary was negotiated during that year. The higher two salaries are no longer available.

Paras are divided into two basic groups, who are actually members of two different unions: The educational paras are UFT members, and the family paras are members of DC 37. Educational paras have such titles as teacher aides and auxiliary trainers, who train and support other paras. The educational paras must spend as least fifty percent of their time in the classroom, and are responsible to teachers.

Family paras assist the guidance and attendance office. They have no classroom time requirements, and deal with students and their families.

Comparative analysis of the organization of the high schools demonstrates that all of the high schools use paras and school aides of some sort. In 1977-78:

-- Fifty-one schools used educational paras, with a range of 528 hours a semester to 11,139 hours;

-- The mean use is 1,916.29 hours per semester

-- The median use is 1,602 hours per semester

-- Twenty-one schools use family paras with a range of 361 hours a semester to 4,224 hours

-- The mean use is 923.48 hours per semester

-- The median use is 619 hours.

School aides are given out in a separate formula reflecting the number of periods per day, the register, the number of buildings and PSEN population. The average number of school aides given to the schools was from a low of 1,263 to a high of 6,693.

-- Sixty-one schools converted a total of 102,527 hourly units into aides ranging, from 90 - 6,766 per school

-- Twenty-three schools used under 1,000 school aide hours

-- Twenty-one schools used between 1,000 - 2,000

Considering the actual use of school aides, including conversion, the average use is 5,202.83 hourly units, with a high of 13,170 hourly units (this particular school converted 6,766) to a low of 1,714.

As one can see from the above figures, there is a tremendous range in the use of paras and school aides among all the schools. Information as to the exact tasks that these individuals are performing and

characteristics of the school and staff which may affect the way they are used is not available. Therefore, it is impossible to examine the particular schools who use a very high or very low number to determine how this can be translated into a management recommendation.[2] However, it can be assumed some of the schools using large numbers of paras and converting units into paras and school aides feel that these individuals can provide valuable services to the secretary or teacher assigned non-teaching tasks. Thus a careful examination of the actual duties being performed in administrative and in-lieu periods should be made by each principal to insure that those duties not requiring the expertise of a teacher are assigned to either secretaries, paras or school aides.

III. IN-LIEU AND ADMINISTRATIVE PERIODS

In-lieu of instruction periods, or compensatory time jobs, involve such things as guidance, organization and administration, supervision and "other" duties, such as maintaining supplies and equipment, assigned to a teacher in place of classes. These periods are not specifically defined within the contract. Administrative assignments are similar duties which teachers are assigned in addition to their classes. The maximum number of administrative assignments permitted by contract is five periods a week. Only those teachers without home room, or official class, assignments plus 35% of the home room teachers may be given an administrative assignment in addition to a 5 period instructional load. If addtional teacher time is necessary, teachers will perform administrative duties in-lieu of teaching. In such cases the reduction in instructional time should be a constideration in determining whether a teacher is necessary for the task.

TABLE 5

Use of Teacher Time - Fall 1978

Number of Periods Per Week

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Instruction	In Lieu: Guidance	In Lieu: Org. & Admin.	In Lieu: Superv. & Curriculum	In Lieu: Other	Total
Abraham Lincoln	2416	165	65	105	-	335
* Alex Hamilton	1530	150	20	25	-	195
* Automotive	1870	105	95	80	-	280
Bay Ridge	1883	115	55	120	-	290
Boys and Girls	4290	300	120	170	-	590
Brooklyn Tech.	6047	255	97	217	-	569
Bushwick	2178	235	65	122	-	422
Canarsie	2179	175	55	116	-	346
Clara Barton	2458	150	65	125	-	340
Eastern District	2055	260	55	5	-	320
* East New York	1895	140	100	85	5	330
Edward R. Murrow	2768	105	55	88	-	248
* Eli Whitney	2450	130	65	95	35	325
Erasmus Hall	3719	275	120	155	-	550
Fort Hamilton	3027	208	50	115	-	373
F.D. Roosevelt	3295	215	100	135	5	455
Franklin K. Lane	4280	475	75	155	15	720
* Geo. Westinghouse	2654	155	75	135	-	365
Geo. W. Wingate	2875	135	210	100	25	470
James Madison	2756	190	120	95	20	425
John Dewey	3513	188	45	110	-	343
John Jay	3502	205	75	190	-	470
Lafayette	2765	190	130	115	-	435
Midwood	2605	180	35	105	-	320
New Utrecht	2413	195	85	125	20	425
Prospect Heights	2417	240	155	100	1	496
Samuel J. Tilden	2361	129	70	115	-	314
Sarah J. Hale	2335	160	130	150	-	440
Sheepshead Bay	2610	145	50	115	-	310
South Shore	4200	275	100	165	-	540
Thomas Jefferson	2899	165	225	161	-	551
* Wm. E. Grady	2425	-	105	75	-	180
* Wm. H. Maxwell	1830	155	80	140	-	375
Sub-total	(92,500)	(6165)	(2947)	(3909)	(126)	(13,147)

TABLE 5

Use of Teacher Time - Fall 1978

Number of Periods Per Week

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Administrative					
	Guidance	Organization & Administration	Supervision & Curriculum	Unclassified Professional	Other	Total
Abraham Lincoln	224	167	116	215	5	727
* Alex Hamilton	148	134	132	-	-	414
* Automotive	142	153	128	-	-	423
Bay Ridge	75	385	90	-	-	550
Boys and Girls	266	184	105	-	-	555
Brooklyn Tech.	283	425	90	479	-	1,277
Bushwick	115	95	70	-	-	280
Canarsie	135	185	115	10	5	450
Clara Barton	147	88	121	-	-	356
Eastern District	501	33	189	-	-	723
* East New York	175	107	107	-	35	424
Edward R. Murrow	180	76	162	380	-	798
* Eli Whitney	150	105	160	-	30	445
Erasmus Hall	307	234	133	-	5	679
Fort Hamilton	234	150	78	-	29	491
F.D. Roosevelt	190	105	75	-	20	390
Franklin K. Lane	155	335	45	-	10	545
* Geo. Westinghouse	106	161	51	-	-	318
Geo. W. Wingate	226	190	92	30	-	538
James Madison	175	65	60	-	5	305
John Dewey	120	180	40	-	-	340
John Jay	153	322	285	-	-	760
Lafayette	363	251	204	-	-	818
Midwood	240	175	90	-	-	505
New Utrecht	174	157	186	-	9	526
Prospect Heights	200	190	50	5	20	465
Samuel J. Tilden	213	128	187	230	-	758
Sarah J. Hale	153	212	381	20	10	776
Sheepshead Bay	280	130	160	-	-	570
South Shore	275	175	215	5	-	670
Thomas Jefferson	211	255	190	-	20	676
* Wm. E. Grady	130	40	-	-	-	170
* Wm. H. Maxwell	146	156	153	160	-	615
	(6,592)	(5,748)	(4,260)	(1,534)	(203)	(18,337)

High School	Instruction	In Lieu: Guidance	In Lieu: Org. & Admin.	In Lieu: Superv. & Curriculum	In Lieu: Other	In Lieu: Total
Andrew Jackson	2265	210	100	120	35	465
August Martin	1798	110	65	88	19	282
* Aviation	3413	20	80	110	-	210
Bayside	3333	175	85	130	-	390
Beach Channel	3355	80	20	95	10	205
Benj. N. Cardozo	2698	200	80	115	-	395
Far Rockaway	1966	140	30	75	15	260
Flushing	2422	140	75	105	10	330
Forest Hills	1915	145	40	100	-	285
Francis Lewis	2375	70	130	95	-	295
Grover Cleveland	3514	90	35	155	-	280
Hillcrest	2959	130	30	140	-	300
Jamaica	2803	240	35	125	-	400
John Adams	4027	265	115	175	20	575
John Bowne	3442	220	80	150	-	450
Long Island City	2790	135	95	90	-	320
Martin Van Buren	2960	190	95	120	-	405
Newtown	3951	270	70	195	25	560
* Queens	1585	90	60	40	-	190
Richmond Hill	2635	170	40	130	-	340
Springfield Gdns.	2875	230	55	115	-	400
* Thomas A. Edison	2754	140	78	50	-	268
William C. Bryant	3165	195	60	170	-	425
Sub-Total	(65,000)	(3655)	(1553)	(2688)	(134)	(8030)
* Art and Design	2583	55	90	99	-	244
Benjamin Franklin	1155	140	55	-	-	195
Chas E. Hughes	2033	95	100	117	-	312
* Chelsea	1115	85	70	45	10	210
* Fashion Industries	2815	155	140	70	75	440
George Washington	2320	220	160	125	30	535
H.S. Music & Art	2638	95	60	130	30	315
Julia Richman	2650	90	180	150	20	440
Louis D. Brandeis	3568	305	175	85	50	615
* Mabel D. Bacon	1372	156	63	79	5	303
* Manhattan	1585	105	30	80	-	215
Martin L. King Jr.	2184	210	179	40	30	459
Murry Bergtraum	2609	60	45	95	-	200
* N.Y. Printing	1910	145	85	60	-	290
Norman Thomas	3040	150	90	100	-	340
Park West	2820	215	205	235	-	655
Seward Park	2793	225	70	160	-	455
Stuyvesant	2785	120	75	103	45	343
Washington Irving	2174	75	205	30	-	310
Sub-total	(44,149)	(2701)	(2077)	(1803)	(295)	(6876)

High School	Administrative: Guidance	Organization & Administration	Supervision & Curriculum	Unclassified Professional	Other	Total
Andrew Jackson	152	70	79	-	22	323
August Martin	145	70	88	-	19	322
* Aviation	50	100	15	-	-	165
Bayside	170	85	45	-	-	300
Beach Channel	169	214	88	-	28	499
Benj. N. Cardozo	140	180	285	35	5	645
Far Rockaway	100	305	5	5	-	415
Flushing	119	178	86	-	7	390
Forest Hills	142	98	140	-	-	380
Francis Lewis	63	174	85	-	-	322
Grover Cleveland	97	202	167	381	5	852
Hillcrest	140	141	91	310	10	692
Jamaica	330	80	90	15	10	525
John Adams	190	675	85	-	10	960
John Bowne	154	262	199	375	-	990
Long Island City	115	166	35	-	-	316
Martin Van Buren	229	138	104	295	10	776
Newtown	265	195	125	-	-	585
* Queens	85	113	95	130	5	428
Richmond Hill	189	105	76	5	-	375
Springfield Gdns.	186	206	168	280	5	845
* Thomas A. Edison	108	404	137	-	25	674
William C. Bryant	195	145	105	-	-	445
	(3,533)	(4,306)	(2,393)	(1,831)	(161)	(12,224)
* Art and Design	97	203	107	225	5	637
Benjamin Franklin	70	20	30	-	-	120
Chas E. Hughes	25	60	50	-	-	135
* Chelsea	95	85	55	105	5	345
* Fashion Industries	174	171	145	-	30	520
George Washington	225	240	125	-	30	620
H.S. Music & Art	115	240	110	160	10	635
Julia Richman	83	111	169	23	-	386
Louis D. Brandeis	170	230	25	-	7	432
* Mabel D. Bacon	130	80	74	-	-	284
* Manhattan	105	30	80	-	-	215
Martin L. King Jr.	150	209	342	-	-	701
Murry Bergtraum	52	124	109	-	-	285
* N.Y. Printing	119	62	71	15	-	267
Norman Thomas	134	203	384	-	10	731
Park West	148	361	328	205	5	1,047
Seward Park	168	237	480	-	-	885
Stuyvesant	85	50	45	-	10	190
Washington Irving	44	261	7	-	-	312
	(2,189)	(2,977)	(2,736)	(733)	(112)	(8,747)

High School	In Lieu: Instruction	Guidance	Org. & Admin.	Superv. & Curriculum	Other	Total
Adlai Stevenson	3395	220	85	200	-	505
* Alfred E. Smith	2010	85	180	85	-	350
Bronx H.S. Science	3477	148	79	113	-	340
C. Columbus	2514	160	75	110	10	355
DeWitt Clinton[1]	3457					
Evander Childs	2570	165	85	105	-	355
* Grace Dodge	2195	110	50	70	-	230
Harry S. Truman	2953	140	45	110	20	315
Herbert Lehman	2795	95	95	125	-	315
James Monroe	2274	210	80	180	-	470
* Jane Addams	1590	110	45	125	-	280
John F. Kennedy	3940	250	90	130	-	470
Morris	2030	195	60	155	5	415
* Samuel Gompers	1180	8	6	-	-	14
South Bronx	785	60	60	15	15	150
Theo. Roosevelt	3398	275	145	175	-	595
Walton	2798	235	100	150	10	495
William H. Taft	3316	140	105	120	-	365
	(46,677)	(2606)	(1385)	(1968)	(60)	(6019)
Curtis	2104	185	100	55	50	390
New Dorp	2380	210	75	85	-	370
Port Richmond	2811	40	120	90	-	250
* Ralph McKee	1556	100	55	49	-	204
Susan E. Wagner	2565	160	70	110	-	340
Tottenville	4410	325	155	155	60	695
	(15,826)	(1020)	(575)	(544)	(110)	(2249)
TOTAL	264,152	16,147	8537	10,912	725	36,321
AVERAGE	2,668	165	87	111	7	371

High School	Administrative: Guidance	Organization & Administration	Supervision & Curriculum	Unclassified Professional	Other	Total
Adlai Stevenson	198	233	241	445	-	1,117
* Alfred E. Smith	202	442	18	-	-	662
Bronx H.S. Science	216	160	100	301	15	792
C. Columbus	140	210	73	-	5	428
DeWitt Clinton [1]	-	-	-	-	-	-
Evander Childs	60	40	45	-	-	145
* Grace Dodge	75	95	132	260	5	567
Harry S. Truman	40	190	60	360	10	660
Herbert Lehman	117	214	295	-	-	626
James Monroe	180	215	55	35	-	485
* Jane Addams	75	130	94	5	-	304
John F. Kennedy	250	120	150	-	-	520
Morris	129	156	160	350	-	795
* Samuel Gompers	9	20	33	-	-	62
South Bronx	80	35	35	-	-	150
Theo. Roosevelt	254	286	167	-	-	707
Walton	100	175	10	-	5	290
William H. Taft	251	291	31	-	-	573
	(2,376)	(3,012)	(1,699)	(1,756)	(40)	(8,883)
Curtis	135	75	45	10	-	265
New Dorp	85	95	45	-	10	235
Port Richmond	101	150	120	-	-	371
* Ralph McKee	93	103	63	168	20	447
Susan E. Wagner	160	70	110	-	-	340
Tottenville	320	630	55	-	-	1,005
	(894)	(1,123)	(438)	(178)	(30)	(2,663)
TOTAL	15,584	17,166	11,526	6,032	546	50,854
AVERAGE	159	175	118	62	6	519

[1] Inaccurate information supplied by school.

There is a tremendous range in the amount of in-lieu periods used in the schools, as can be seen by Table 5, from a low of fourteen to a high of 695 periods a week. The average number per school is 371 periods, and thirteen schools use over 500 periods a week. Examining Table 5, on total administrative periods, one sees a great range of periods spent by teachers in non-teaching time, from sixty-two periods to a high of 1,277 periods a week. Certainly, there are non-teaching duties that should be performed by teachers. But, many of these periods do not require their expertise, and there are substantial savings to be found within the limited high school budget if personnel are assigned in the most effective manner. For example, in-lieu time should only be used for tasks which demand pedagogical expertise and only if administrative periods have been utilized to the limit.[2] The use of administrative periods reflect the programming preferences of principals, and as we discuss in our chapter on contract issues, the number of teachers eligible for administrative periods by eliminating the thirty-five percent official class rule could make a substantial improvement in the administration of the school. "Some schools may require more administrative duties to be performed by teachers because of a large student body, diverse curricular offerings, or the socio-economic status of the students. In order to provide time for these administrative duties such as advising students or keeping the schools' financial records, the principal will assign these teachers less instructional time."[3] The most efficient assignment of these duties should be in administrative periods, and not in-lieu periods which do not supplement teaching time, but replace it. "The Board could better allocate teacher time to increase classroom instruction by shifting such tasks as school treasurer, or-

dering and maintaining supplies and equipment and working in the attendance and transportation offices from in-lieu of instruction to administrative assignments."[4]

The Citizens Budget Commission divided those duties which their analysis showed could be performed by non-pedagogical personnel. Those activities which they felt could be performed by secretaries were:

-- clerical work in attendance office

-- telephoning substitute teachers

-- management of the G.O. Store

-- bus and subway passes

-- development of examinations and posting schedules

-- issuance of working papers

-- liaison with Neighborhood Youth Corps.

-- Health Counselor (nursery employees only)

-- administrative assistant

-- processing of New Transfer Admissions to the school

-- school printing

In addition, two functions were listed as activities which could be performed by Patrol Guards: "patrols of a non-supervisory nature, and patrols now performed by deans (in certain schools)."[5]

The Comptroller estimated that "by shifting to non-teachers, those in-lieu of instructor activities which make little or no use of teaching skills, about 7,300 periods of additional classroom instruction can be gained with academic and vocational high schools."[6]

In addition, he proposed that if the thirty-five percent rule was rescinded (see Chapter IV on contracts) an additional 11,500 periods would be available for instruction, converting half of the remaining in-lieu periods to administrative assignments. The comptroller estimated that this represents 720 teachers, and by removing teachers from such tasks, 183 non-pedagogues would have to be hired for the administrative chores now being performed by the teachers. Thus, the savings by eliminating most in-lieu periods and having non-pedagogues (hired at the secretarial rate) do administrative tasks not requiring teacher expertise would be a unit savings of 510.71 or $9,678,465.21.

720.00 units

- 109.29 units (183 x 0.63)

510.71 units

If the school is able to use paras or school aides for these periods, the savings would be even higher, and they would have even more units available for other uses.

IV. GUIDANCE COUNSELORS

A major use of in-lieu time is for guidance work. We do not wish to unnecessarily restrict principals in designing a guidance program, but certain issues deserve examination.

Due to the specialized nature of guidance personnel, as of September, 1973, full and part time counselors are required to possess a New York State Certificate of Guidance, and the school boards, superintendents, executive directors and principals were reminded of these regulations

in a special circular (#84) sent by the Executive Director of the Division of Personnel in June, 1976. Following the distribution of circular #84, the then Director of High Schools sent a notice dated June 13, stating that the circular was for informational purposes only, and no action was required on their parts. The result of all of this is that as of June, 1977, 84% of those individuals involved in full or part time guidance work were lacking certificates.[6] In correspondence between the Director of Pupil Personnel Services of the State Education Department and the New York City Board of Education, Director of the Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance to clarify the regulations in the spring of 1977, it was recognized that all persons doing at least five (5) hours a week of guidance work are required to have a state certificate. Therefore, since only sixteen percent of those doing guidance work in 1977 were fully certified, most New York City high schools are not in compliance with State law.

A. OBJECTIONS RAISED TO THE INCREASED USE OF COUNSELORS AND RESPONSES TO THESE OBJECTIONS

Our sample included principals who are re-organizing their guidance programs to exclude teachers from these assignments. However, other principals are reluctant to institute these changes. Three major reasons were put forward.

1. They object to taking the counselor off the eligibility list, and prefer to use the guidance position as a reward or as a way to remove someone from the classroom.

First of all, "good" teachers should remain in the classroom, and "less effective" teachers certainly should not be providing needed counseling services to the students. In addition, the principals are aware of who is on the eligibility list, and there is a practice for a principal to withhold announcing a slot until his choice of counselor is "reachable."

2. Principals claim that the counselors from the eligibility list don't know the school, and don't have class programming experience.

The lag that would result in a counselor coming to a new school would appear to be similar in nature to the initiation period needed by teachers who are assigned to the guidance office on a rotating basis. The initiation of the teachers to this role would occur more frequently, because of the rotating requirement, than the one time introduction of a counselor to the school. In addition, all teachers have a departmental focus on their particular field, and would not necessarily know the rest of the school's program better than a new counselor would.

3. Principals continue to insist that it is more expensive to have guidance counselors than to use grade advisors.

It is actually more expensive to use grade advisors than it is to use counselors. Some principals indicated that, because of the contract, guidance counselors are prohibited from doing any clerical

work for programming, and teachers can do this work. We feel that this is an expensive use of teacher time, and the problem could be corrected by the appropriate use of paraprofessionals assisting the guidance counselors.

B. POTENTIAL SAVINGS FROM INCREASED USE OF GUIDANCE COUNSELORS

The idea of a higher cost accrued through the use of guidance counselors results from a misunderstanding of the formula, relying on a comparison of the unit values (1.0 for a teacher, 1.13 for a counselor) rather than looking at the periods per day the two groups are available to provide guidance services. Potential savings could actually be accrued by increased counselor use, as demonstrated by the use of September, 1977 figures of teacher time spent on guidance.

First, according to the Bureau of Guidance, guidance counselors work the equivalent of nine periods a day, while a teacher works a maximum of six, if assigned one administrative period daily in addition to five classroom periods. In 1977, there were 306 guidance counselors in the city high schools, at 1.13 units each, or a total of 345.78 units. This cost represents 3,112.02 periods spent by counselors in guidance.

(306 counselors = 345.78 units = 3,112.02 periods for guidance).

665.48 equivalent teacher units were used, resulting in 3,327.4 periods if a teacher worked five periods a day, or 3,992.88 if a teacher worked five periods plus a sixth administrative period in the guidance office.

(665.48 units = 3,327.4 periods for guidance, at five periods a day).

(665.48 units = 3,992.88 periods for guidance, at six periods a day).

C. COMPUTATION OF SAVINGS BASED ON A SIX PERIOD DAY

Assuming that the teachers are working the additional period a day, (and therefore arriving at a more conservative estimate of savings), the same number of periods for guidance work could be done by hiring an additional 444 counselors.

(444 counselors = 501.72 units = 3,992.88 periods for guidance).

Therefore, although the counselors are more costly in unit value, because they work an additional period a day, hiring counselors can actually result in a unit savings:

665.48 teacher units for 3,992.88 guidance periods

- 501.72 counselor units for 3,992.88 guidance periods

163.76 units saved = $3,103,415.76

Hiring the needed paraprofessionals to assist the counselors, and hiring only those who have a high school diploma and thirty college credits, one could assign one para for every two counselors and still have a substantial savings.

306 counselors presently employed

+ 444 additional counselors needed

750 total number of guidance counselors (proposed)

$\frac{750}{2}$ = 375 paras with high school diplomas and 30 college credits at $4.63/hour, 180 days, five hours a day = $4,167/year for one para.

375 paras = $1,562,625.

Total proposed savings:

$3,103,415.76 (savings by using counselors)

- 1,562,625.00 (cost of paras)

$1,540.790.76 total savings (equals 81.3 units)

If the paraprofessionals hired were required to only have a high school diploma, an even greater savings could be made:

375 paras with high school diplomas at $3.79/hour

180 days, five hours a day = $3,411/year for one para

375 paras = $1,279,125.00

Total proposed savings:

$3,103,415.76 (savings by using counselors)

- 1,279,125.00 (cost of paras)

$1,824,290.76 total savings (equals 96.26 units)

All of this computation is based on the assumption that the teachers work five periods a day and one administrative period in the guidance office, totalling six periods.

D. RECOMPUTATION OF SAVINGS BASED ON A FIVE PERIOD DAY

Considering that some teachers are not assigned the additional administrative period daily and only work five periods a day, including their time in the guidance office, the savings accrued by hiring additional counselors could be even greater:

665.48 teacher units for 3,327.4 guidance periods

- 418.10 counselor units for 3,327.4 guidance periods (370 counselors)

247.38 units saved (equals $4,688,098.38)

Hiring the 375 paraprofessionals needed reduces the savings:

$4,688,098.38 savings from using counselors

- 1,562,625.00 cost of paras at $4.63/hour (with 30 college credits)

3,125,473.38 total saved (164.92 units)

Using less expensive paraprofessionals, at $3.79 per hour (with high school diploms) the savings would be:

$4,688,098.38 savings from using counselors

- 1,279,125.00 cost of paras

$3,408,973.38 total saved (179.88 units)

Thus, the savings available by hiring additional counselors and the necessary paraprofessionals to assist them, and thus freeing the teachers for instructional duties would range from $1,540,790.76 to $3,408,973.38 depending on the number of periods the teachers actually work and the level of paraprofessionals hired. (All the computations are based on the average teacher salary of $18,951). Obviously, we are assuming that guidance counselors provide services to students for a full 9 period day.

V. SCHOOL SECRETARIES

Other savings could be realized by examining current requirements for school secretaries and the duties they perform. The creation of a new personnel title would increase a principal's choices and flexibility. School secretaries are equal to 0.63 units, which has a salary worth of $12,096, based on the most recent average teacher salary of $18,951. In addition, there are school secretary interns, at a unit worth of 0.42, who perform stenographic services for assistant principals-supervisors, in high schools. Currently, a school secretary must have at least two years of college, two years of experience and good typing and dictation skills. In our discussion with the school principals in the sample, many of them stated that it was not necessary to have all secretaries in the school so highly qualified. In most schools, only three or four secretaries took dictation as part of their regular duties. With this in mind, it would

appear to be cost effective to have a second tier of secretaries who have a high school diploma and take no shorthand. According to the comparative analysis of the organization of the high schools, in 1977, there were 984.6 school secretaries in academic and vocational high schools, and 77.9 school secretary interns. The range of secretaries in the schools goes from a high of fifteen to a low of four. Assuming that as the principals indicated, only four secretaries have to be so highly qualified, 584.6 secretarial positions could be changed to a "level two" secretary. Comparing the civil service salary rates for comparable positions, such as office aides who start at $7,000 and increase to $8,350, an average salary for the level two secretaries could be $8,000 with the excellent fringe benefits associated with the Board of Education. Thus, their unit worth would be 0.42 units. To simplify the units involved, the school secretary interns, now worth 0.38 units, would become a part of the level two group.

The projected savings in units based on 1977-78 figures would be:

984.6 secretaries currently

\- 400.0 four secretaries per school (proposed)

584.6 secretaries changed to level two

\+ 77.9 school secretarial interns changed to level two

662.5 level two secretaries

Current unit worth of 984.6 secretaries	= 620.29
Current unit worth of 77.9 school sec. interns	= + 29.60
Current unit cost of secretarial service	= 649.89

Proposed change:

400 secretaries at unit worth 0.63	=	252.00 units
662.5 level two secretaries at unit worth 0.42	=	278.25 units
		530.25 units

Proposed savings:

649.89 current units for school sec. + interns

- 530.25 proposed units with two levels of secretaries

119.64 units which could be redistributed within the schools

In addition to the unit savings, a fringe benefit savings would be made, as fringes on 584.6 positions would no longer be made on a salary of $12,096, but on a lesser salary.

Thus, by not reducitg secretarial staff size, but rather making the requirements for some secretaries less stringent, the schools would have an additional 119.64 units available to them, or a savings could be made of $2,267,297.64, using the December figure for unit worth ($18,951).

NOTES

1. These unit values include fringe benefits as well as salary costs.

2. In order to determine the number of administrative periods available in each school, more than 11,000 program cards would have to be examined.

3. City of New York, Office of the Comptroller, The Use of Teacher Time by the New York City Board of Education, May, 1978, p. 26.

4. Ibid., p. 6.

5. Citizens Budget Commission, Inc., Better Utilization of Teachers in New York City Secondary Schools, February, 1973, pp. 20-21.

6. City of New York, op. cit., p. 77.

7. Memo to the Chancellor from the Director, Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance, March 14, 1977.

CHAPTER III

MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AT CENTRAL DIVISIONS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Many of the problems faced by high school principals are the result of actions taken by the Board of Education itself. Often, the support given by central divisions is counter-productive or obstructs effective management at the school level. In addition, decisions and regulations made by other oversight bodies, although they are conceived as a means of ensuring quality education, often become impediments when they are implemented at specific high schools.

I. BUREAU OF SUPPLIES

In the course of interviewing eighteen principals, unanimous agreement was reached that there is insufficient money available in the OTPS budget. Considering the fiscal state of the city, this certainly is not surprising, nor is it likely to change in the near future. What must be examined, then, is the value of the dollars and their use. It appears that the OTPS budget should buy many more supplies for the high schools than it does now.

In considering how OTPS funds are made available to the schools, it was found that some of these sorely needed funds are actually lost to the schools. This is primarily due to problems within the central office of OTPS at the high school division and with the Bureau of Supplies. The Bureau of Supplies is the purchasing agent for the Board of Education. For the 1978 fiscal year, it acted as a conduit for the purchasing of approximately $150 million in goods and services, the approximate yearly expenditure.[1] Orders for warehoused supplies are placed with the Bureau of Supplies (BOS), at which time the necessary

funds are deducted from a school's OTPS allocation. However, should a specific item not be available, schools are often not informed of this situation in a timely fashion. The result is that as the fiscal year draws to a close, the school does not obtain the supplies and is unable to order an alternative item. The money is returned to the Board of Education as an accrual and the school is not allowed to even spend the limited funds that were allocated.

Non-warehoused supplies, representing ninety-eight percent of all supplies, are delivered directly to schools by the vendors on the basis of a "Master Requirement Contract."[2] Many of the principals pointed out that the Board of Education, due to mismanagement, overly stringent requirements and specifications, and a reputation among vendors for delayed payments, was unable to obtain a fair price. A minimum of thirty days is required for a vendor to receive payment, assuming that the school immediately processes a receipt notice. Payment may, however, be delayed as long as eighteen to twenty-four months, and in some cases, payment is never made.[3] This inevitably inflates the price on BOS master requirement contracts.

Principals repeatedly stated that they could purchase higher quality supplies that would better meet their needs at a lower price if they were allowed to purchase directly from vendors. The Educational Priorities Panel released a study in May, 1978, "Bidding and Purchasing, A Management Study of the Bureau of Pupil Transportation, Bureau of Supplies, and the Office of School Food Services" which documents the situation described by principals. The report found that, "the Bureau of Supplies has failed to use competitive bidding, has failed to keep accurate inventories and usage reports, and has failed to guarantee

training of school and district personnel involved in purchasing. These weaknesses may have cost the City up to $15 million a year."[4]

In addition, "BOS is unable to save money on the price-per-unit because they cannot establish an estimated quantity that can be verified."[5] If BOS does not have the information or capacity to achieve savings through bulk purchasing, there would be no disadvantage to purchases, on small quantities, at the school level.

SUPPLIES AND THE HIGH SCHOOLS

There are set procedures for various levels of awarding contracts, and the contracts valued between $100 and $999.99 have seven parts:

1. Preparation of Bid Summary Form including specifications.
2. Identification of prospective bidders (at least ten).
3. Contacting of prospective bidders by telephone or mail.
4. Receipt of confirmation of telephone bids.
5. Tabulation of bids.
6. Award of contract.
7. Filing of copy of Bid Summary Form with vendor file copy of purchase order.

Knowing of the multiple steps involved in purchasing supplies, most of the principals still feel that they would prefer to do the purchasing themselves. Part of this is because they feel they can get more supplies for their dollars and partly because they would have a better chance of getting the supplies at all.

We feel that this option should be experimented with, perhaps in

a pilot program with a number of schools receiving an OTPS discretionary fund to purchase items below $500. This program should include both vocational and academic schools of varying sizes, for a period of at least two years.

We understand that BOS, now under the direction of Dave Wolovick, is undergoing a major re-organizaiton. A new computer program has also been developed to generate purchase orders, keep inventories, and track all necessary information. Finally, a training program has been organized for assistant stockmen with the cooperation of their union, DC 37. We would urge high schools to take advantage of this program. The panel is encouraged by these positive steps and will continue to monitor progress at BOS.

II. DIVISION OF HIGH SCHOOLS OTPS OFFICE

Additional difficulties occur with the OTPS funds for the high schools because of the nature of the central OTPS office. This office serves to hand out the OTPS allocations and to place the orders from the high schools with either the Bureau of Supplies or the vendors. Currently, it does not appear to do either task with great efficiency.

Basically, once a school's allotment is computed by the formula, the allocating of OTPS funds is straightforward, and should be accomplished with little difficulty. However, there are repeated delays which postpone the actual allocation to the schools. While the allocations for Personal Services for the spring semester were handed out before Christmas, 1978, the annual OTPS funds for the school year starting in September had not been given out as of January 4, 1979. This places the schools in a difficult position. Without any hard figures, they must order supplies for the school year. Certain schools go into deficit spending to pay for supplies before they even receive

the fundings. There was some indication from our interviews that deficit spending was done more freely than it would be if they actually had the allocation because they had the excuse that, without the exact figure, they didn't realize that they had overspent. Certainly, a greater effort should be made to provide the schools with their OTPS allotment in a more timely fashion.

It is our understanding in talking to people at the Division of High Schools that, as of next year, the annual OTPS allocation will be distributed at the same time as the schools receive the unit allotment for the fall term, i.e. the preceding spring. The allocation will be based on the audited register of the previous term, rather than waiting until after October 31. We certainly support this change as a first step and feel it should eliminate the excessive delays now experienced. In addition, however, we would suggest that the allotment be given out bi-annually, at the same time as the unit allocation for each semester. In the past, the Division of High Schools has discovered large surpluses in the late spring. We suggest that by dividing the OTPS into two allotments, for each semester, there would be less likelihood of such a large surplus occuring. The fall OTPS allotment would be conservative, as it would be based on the previous year's register. The spring allotment could reflect any surpluses that appeared during the first semester, ensuring that all available funds were available where they are needed, at the schools, rather than allowing surpluses to be returned to the general fund.

In addition, we feel that the OTPS funds should be included in the unit allocation formula, thus eliminating the need for a separate office and incorporated the distribution of the funds into the Office

of Organization and Planning. The other major task performed by this office, placing orders for supplies for the schools, could also be eliminated. This additional bureaucratic layer does not provide a more efficient mechanism for obtaining supplies. Instead, it is a time-consuming practice which produces delays and the possibility of additional error. Inexperience with a new computer system resulted in a $46,000 mistake at the OTPS office which was repaid from the high schools' 1978-79 allocation. Each school could place its order independently with BOS. An efficient system at BOS could easily monitor aggregate purchases for the Division of High Schools.

Also, in FY 1979, $1,838,347 was reserved before the OTPS allocations were made to the schools.[6] This represented 43.65% of the total OTPS funds. While some of this should be administered centrally (i.e. OTPS for superintendent's offices, city-wide exams, diplomas, special allocation for new schools), other items could be included in the general allocation to the schools, such as student activities and postage. The OTPS office could become a limited office which acts as ombudsman as problems arise between the high schools and the Bureau of Supplies or contracted vendors. The structure of the OTPS central office should be examined to determine how to best perform such a limited role, and other duties assigned to it should be changed to align the OTPS funds with the unit allocation.

III. SECURITY

Currently, schools organize their building security by combining several types of personnel: school guards, aides, teachers on administrative duty, and often the school administrators themselves. Primarily, however, the security is supposed to be supplied by the Office of School Safety (OSS), which acts as a distinct department

for the hiring, training, assigning and administering of a city-wide school security force. This force is divided among the boroughs, but the personnel remain responsible to the Office of School Safety. However, OSS has no interaction with any other personnel assigned to security duties. The security guards are supposed to work for the principals, and are subject to their evaluation, in addition to being evaluated by the Office of School Safety.

The principals we spoke to had three major complaints:

1. Their guards were not responsive enough to the principals and should be supervised locally.
2. Attendance rate for guards is very low.
3. No single guard is assigned to supervise the other guards.

It is our understanding that this last problem was recently corrected, and one guard per school receives additional money and additional responsibilities.

None of the principals wanted the responsibility of hiring the guards, nor of training the personnel. Only one principal stated that he felt he had control over his guards, primarily due to giving out their assignments, while all the other principals felt that they would prefer to have the right to fire or reassign the guards if they proved inefficient.

The rationale for an Office of School Safety is to provide a professionally trained security staff to the schools. However, this office has created a division in responsibility and authority among security personnel. Guards are supervised by both the principal and

and OSS, which fractionalizes authority. The principal supervises all other staff which perform security-related duties (aides, teachers, etc.), while OSS, supposedly expert in the field, has no impact on this staff. Most importantly, considering the absentee rate and the need for coverage by untrained personnel, the contribution of the guards must be questioned.

It is of paramount importance that New York City high schools provide a safe environment for education. The Office of School Safety may not be fulfilling its purpose adequately and deserves further study.

IV. THE DIVISION OF HIGH SCHOOLS: REGISTER ESTIMATES

The unit allocation for the fall semester is based on the estimated register computed in May or June of the previous school year. It is important for the schools to be as accurate as possible in their estimate to ensure that accurate allocations can be made. Penalties are handed out for overestimating the register by more than two percent, and by underestimating by more than this amount, the school generally loses units that might otherwise have been a part of the amount allocated. (If there is a substantial underestimate, the school may be awarded a unit in the fall, at the price of major rescheduling and disruption for staff and students).

The estimating of one's register is a difficult process, and involves a constant reassessment. Principals must take into account the transient nature of their community, the expected number of walk-ins in September, open enrollment, and any other indicators used in the past.

For the year 1978-79;

51 schools changed their estimates after June 15,

18 schools changed estimates more than one time; and

28 schools changed on or after September 1, 1978.

In the final estimate, as shown in Table I;

50 schools were within 2%, either above or below,

52 overestimated, 27 over the 2% limit, and

46 underestimated, 22 over the 2% limit;

1 school estimated exactly.

Therefore, penalties should be assessed against 27 schools for over-estimating.

Often there are factors which produce a wrong estimate that are unavoidable, such as new zoning decisions or an unusually large number of walk-ins in September, or decisions by the State Education Department. Central Division seems sympathetic to these occurences when assessing penalties against a school. No school has to pay back more than five units.[7] In addition, if a total payback would be too disruptive to the school's programming, a realistic figure is agreed to through negotiations between the principal and the Division. A certain number of units are held back each year (twenty for the school year 1978-79) for such dealings, to pay for those penalties which are reversed because of situations beyond the control of the school. Although this process seems particularly complex, it also appears to be responsive to the needs of the schools.

There are, however, three suggestions we would like to make regarding penalties. First, because of the flexibility in requiring schools to pay back units from over-estimating, there is a possibility that certain schools would tend to over-estimate continually, knowing that they will not have to pay back all the extra units. A school should be required to establish that an over-estimate was due to circumstances beyond its control or to misinformation from Central or the feeder schools, or else be forced to pay the full penalty regardless of size.

TABLE 1

FALL 1978 - ACCURACY OF ESTIMATED REGISTERS

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	A Final Estimate	B Adjusted Audited Registers	Difference A-B	2% of Adjusted Audited Register	Is Estimate Within 2% ?
Abraham Lincoln	2,767	2,718	+49	54.36	Yes
* Alex Hamilton	1,500	1,234	+266	24.68	No
* Automotive	1,636	1,666	-30	33.32	Yes
Bay Ridge	2,110	2,145	-35	42.90	Yes
Boys and Girls	4,542	4,020	+522	80.40	No
Brooklyn Tech.	5,860	5,771	+89	115.42	Yes
Bushwick	2,556	2,757	-201	55.14	No
Canarsie	2,482	2,519	-37	50.38	Yes
Clara Barton	2,362	2,318	+44	46.36	Yes
Eastern District	2,554	2,479	+75	49.58	No
* East New York	1,640	1,653	-13	33.06	Yes
Edward R. Murrow	2,569	2,565	+4	51.30	Yes
* Eli Whitney	2,199	2,208	-9	44.16	Yes
Erasmus Hall	4,180	3,887	+293	77.74	No
Fort Hamilton	3,517	3,574	-57	71.48	Yes
F.D. Roosevelt	3,850	3,803	+47	76.06	Yes
Franklin K. Lane	4,636	4,792	-156	95.84	No
* Geo. Westinghouse	2,309	2,233	+76	44.66	No
Geo. W. Wingate	3,139	3,208	-69	64.16	No
James Madison	3,243	3,135	+108	62.70	No
John Dewey	3,467	3,387	+80	67.74	No
John Jay	4,034	3,940	+94	78.80	No
Lafayette	3,191	3,236	-45	64.72	Yes
Midwood	2,823	2,676	+147	53.52	No
New Utrecht	2,706	2,706	0	54.12	Yes
Prospect Heights	2,820	2,887	-67	57.74	No
Samuel J. Tilden	2,716	2,734	-18	54.68	Yes
Sarah J. Hale	2,317	2,406	-89	48.12	No
Sheepshead Bay	2,998	2,955	+43	59.10	Yes
South Shore	4,310	4,344	-34	86.88	Yes
Thomas Jefferson	3,551	3,643	-92	72.86	No
* Wm. E. Grady	2,150	2,085	+65	41.70	No
* Wm. H. Maxwell	1,847	1,754	+93	35.08	No
	(98,581)	(97,438)	(+1,143)		

High School	A Final Estimate	B Adjusted Audited Registers	Difference A-B	2% of Adjusted Audited Register	Is Estimate Within 2%?
Andrew Jackson	2,525	2,617	-92	52.34	No
August Martin	2,020	1,934	+86	38.68	No
* Aviation	2,647	2,704	-57	54.08	No
Bayside	3,664	3,610	+54	72.20	Yes
Beach Channel	3,403	3,412	-9	68.24	Yes
Benj. N. Cardozo	2,952	2,932	+20	58.64	Yes
Far Rockaway	2,140	2,156	-16	43.12	Yes
Flushing	2,613	2,534	+79	50.68	No
Forest Hills	2,229	2,273	-44	45.46	Yes
Francis Lewis	2,833	2,864	-31	57.28	Yes
Grover Cleveland	3,832	3,951	-119	79.02	No
Hillcrest	3,065	3,032	+33	60.64	Yes
Jamaica	3,079	3,088	-9	61.76	Yes
John Adams	4,589	4,539	+50	90.78	Yes
John Bowne	3,754	3,698	+56	73.96	Yes
Long Island City	3,224	3,203	+21	64.06	Yes
Martin Van Buren	3,321	3,337	-16	66.74	Yes
Newtown	4,368	4,474	-106	89.48	No
* Queens	1,279	1,210	+69	24.20	No
Richmond Hill	2,785	2,637	+148	52.74	No
Springfield Gdns.	3,094	3,067	+27	61.31	Yes
* Thomas A. Edison	2,377	2,301	+76	46.02	No
William C. Bryant	3,596	3,671	-75	73.42	No
	(69,389)	(69,244)	(+145)		
* Art and Design	2,300	2,259	+41	45.18	Yes
Benjamin Franklin	1,497	1,765	-268	35.30	No
Chas E. Hughes	2,300	2,244	+56	44.88	No
* Chelsea	1,073	1,041	+32	20.82	No
* Fashion Industries	2,674	2,382	+292	47.64	No
George Washington	2,783	3,043	-260	60.86	No
H.S. Music & Art	2,427	2,451	-24	49.02	Yes
Julia Richman	3,187	3,157	+30	63.14	Yes
Louis D. Brandeis	3,915	3,924	-9	78.48	Yes
* Mabel D. Bacon	1,278	1,252	+26	25.04	No
* Manhattan	1,473	1,496	-23	29.92	Yes
Martin L. King Jr.	2,286	2,365	-79	47.30	No
Murry Bergtraum	2,550	2,492	+58	49.84	No
* N.Y. Printing	1,648	1,685	-37	33.70	No
Norman Thomas	2,918	2,951	-33	59.02	Yes
Park West	2,991	3,763	-772	75.26	No
Seward Park	3,261	3,247	+14	64.94	Yes
Stuyvesant	2,780	2,754	+26	55.08	Yes
Washington Irving	2,403	2,336	+67	46.72	No
	(45,744)	(46,607)	(-863)		

High School	A Final Estimate	B Adjusted Audited Registers	Difference A-B	2% of Adjusted Audited Register	Is Estimate Within 2%?
Adlai Stevenson	3,904	4,116	-212	82.32	No
* Alfred E. Smith	1,813	1,690	+123	33.80	No
Bronx H.S. Science	3,373	3,304	+69	66.08	No
C. Columbus	2,790	2,928	-138	58.56	No
DeWitt Clinton	3,968	3,937	+31	78.74	Yes
Evander Childs	2,963	3,190	-227	63.80	No
* Grace Dodge	1,939	1,927	+12	38.54	Yes
Harry S. Truman	3,200	3,228	-28	64.56	Yes
Herbert Lehman	3,008	3,079	-71	61.58	No
James Monroe	2,422	2,462	-40	49.24	Yes
* Jane Addams	1,518	1,495	+23	29.90	Yes
John F. Kennedy	4,439	4,560	-121	91.20	No
Morris	2,279	2,450	-171	49.00	No
* Samuel Gompers	985	1,001	-16	20.02	Yes
South Bronx	722	659	+63	13.18	No
Theo. Roosevelt	3,862	3,884	-22	77.68	Yes
Walton	3,133	3,084	+49	61.68	Yes
William H. Taft	3,896	3,691	+205	73.82	No
	(50,214)	(50,685)	(-471)		
Curtis	2,234	2,243	-9	44.86	Yes
New Dorp	2,715	2,663	+52	53.26	Yes
Port Richmond	2,950	2,928	+22	58.56	Yes
* Ralph McKee	1,333	1,299	+34	25.98	No
Susan E. Wagner	2,920	2,883	+37	57.66	Yes
Tottenville	4,820	4,798	+22	95.96	Yes
	(16,972)	(16,814)	(+158)		
TOTAL	280,900	280,788	(-122)		

Secondly, schools that underestimate and are given the opportunity to have additional units at the beginning of the semester should have the option of taking the unit or rolling it over to the next semester, (except, of course, from the spring term to the fall, as this would cross fiscal years,). In talking to principals who underestimated, it was discovered that the problems associated with rescheduling the courses to accomodate for additional units outweighed the value of having that additional unit. Moreover, the position is often not filled until the end of the semester, although the school is charged for the unit for the entire period. As this is in actuality unspent money, unit accruals are compiled at the Central Division that should be alloted to the specific school. Principals should have the option of deciding early in the semester whether they want to accept the unit, regardless of when personnel becomes available, or wait and start the next semester with an additional unit.

Lastly, there is some discussion as to who has the final determination in setting an estimated register. A principal submits his/her estimate to the Central Division, which then can, and sometimes does, change this figure according to their expectations and experiential tables. This is basically a difference of opinion regarding the strongest indicators of what can be expected to happen. We feel that the principal should have the final determination on the estimated register, knowing that he or she will be responsible for any errors that occur. It is better policy to allow the individual who will have to accomodate for any mistakes to have the stronger voice in the decision. (Principals can receive additional units, based on their information after the term has begun, if they waive the 2% rule. The High School Division does seem to be reasonable in negotiating estimates with the schools.)

V. THE DIVISION OF HIGH SCHOOL: THE APPLICATION PROCESS

A. CURRENT APPLICATION PROCESS

Accurate estimates are also difficult to achieve because of the complex application processes for the various schools and their programs. Not only is the process a hindrance in estimating the register, but, it presents difficulties for the incoming students.

Basically, the application process for this year is as follows:

a) For the specialized schools, the students must submit their name and choices to the counselor by October 23. By November 13, transmittal forms must be submitted to the schools by the counselors. The test for the science schools are given in late December. Students are notified sometime in February as to whether they have been accepted, at which point the student has up to two weeks to notify the guidance counselor whether he or she will accept.

b) For Educational Options courses, the students are required to complete applications and transmittal forms by December 4. Although some of the schools which offer the educational options are zoned schools,

even those students within that zone must submit an application. Examples of some of the programs available are pre-vet, pre-law, aviation and computer science. The programs are three year sequences for entry level jobs as well as for continued post-secondary training. For some, an interview or audition may be required.

c) For this year, the applications for the educational options are due before screened vocational courses, whose transmittal forms are due December 4 and the completed applications due February 19.

d) For the specialized courses in academic-comprehensive high schools, transmittal forms are due December 4, and the completed applications are due May 4, (the exceptions to this are the pre-med programs at Hillcrest and Midwood where the completed applications and transmittal forms are due December 4). Examinations for these courses are given in January.

3) Lastly, the completed applications and transmittal forms for the unscreened vocational programs are due March 19.

This is the first year that the applications for the educational options courses are due before the screened vocational courses.

"Feedback from the schools revealed that thousands of students changed their high school plans after receiving notification of acceptance by educational options and special programs late in the school year. Many schools had to make drastic changes with organization as a result. . ."[8]

Often, vocational schools held positions for students who ultimately withdrew their acceptance. Now, with the vocational schools having later application dates, it is hoped that vacancies would be eliminated in the vocational schools and be filled in a timely fashion by qualified applicants, rather than causing additional changes down the line by filling the slots at a later date.

In May, the feeder schools are required to notify the zoned schools of the expected registers. High school principals blamed late and/or inaccurate information from feeder schools as well as misplaced transcripts for the inaccuracies of the registers for incoming students.

B. THE NEED FOR STANDARDIZATION

There are two major problems with the complexity of this application process: first, its effect on the entering students; and secondly, its effect on the high schools' planning for the fall semester. There is no question that the students should have the opportunity to apply for all types of programs. But the complexity and duplicity of the process place some limitation on the students' ability to make a choice. It would seem that some standardization of the application process could assist both the student and the schools, and, indeed, there has been a task force within the high schools during this past year to devise standardized admission tests for screened vocational and academic programs (excluding the specialized schools). A standardized reading and math test was recently devised in cooperation with all the assistant principals in "shops," but primarily because no cut-off grades for the different programs have been devised, the test could not be used as the sole test this year. The tests are being distributed to all the vocational and

academic schools willing to use them on an experimental basis. Although some schools may require special aptitude tests, it would seem that sections testing these aptitudes could be added on and used for the tests at the appropriate schools. The current aptitude tests being used at schools such as Aviation, testing spatial relations, for example, are old and a number of the people we spoke with indicated that they will be rewritten in the next few years. The idea of one test should be kept in mind as the new testing materials are devised. In addition, we would recommend that the tests be given on the weekends or during holiday periods to reduce the loss of instructional time both for the applicants and the high school students who must leave the school to provide space for the tests.

The standardization of the tests could also ease the pressures experienced by the junior high school student applying for different high schools. We would strongly recommend the creation of a single notification process, including a listing of the programs which have accepted a student. This would eliminate the possibility of repeated rejections to a student applying to several programs and be a more positive support of the student's initiation into high school. It could be done for the programs requiring screening, and then the students would notify the guidance office within two weeks of their decision. This could also eliminate the problem of multiple acceptances. A student would not need to accept at a "safe school," confusing high school registers. He or she would receive all information at the same time and be better able to choose. If a single computerized application were used, the entire process would be less cumbersome and more efficient for the students, the feeder schools, and the high schools.

VI. DIVISION OF HIGH SCHOOLS: DISCRETE UNITS

The overall unit allocation formula provides for a certain number of units to be given at the discretion of the Director of the High School Division, and others at the discretion of the borough superintendents. Table 2 indicates how many total discretes were given to each high school for the fall of 1978. In the fall of 1978, the director of the High School Division gave out 659.29 discrete units, and in the spring 1979, 523.91 discrete units were distributed. 292.98 of these units from the fall semester were used for instruction-related functions, while 341.63 of the spring discretes were used for such purposes. In the boroughs, the superintendents hand their units out in different ways. One superintendent simply gives each school an equal share of the discrete units available to him, while others rely more on the special needs some schools may have for additional teaching personnel, innovative course offerings, school guards, or guidance and attendance personnel. For the fall term of 1978, for example, the superintendent in the Bronx was given thirty discrete units of which 13.6 were used for class size adjustment, mini and alternative schools, and instructional services, 3.32 were used for guidance and attendance. In Brooklyn and Staten Island, the superintendent received thirty-two discrete units, of which 10.46 were used for programming, counselling, and guidance support, 6.32 were used for attendance improvement, and 13.82 were used for instructor related functions. The Queens superintendent distributes his 42.09 units fairly equally between the schools for innovative programs, while in Manhattan for the fall 1978 semester, the superintendent received 28.4 units which appear to be distributed for a variety of purposes, however specific amounts could not be identified.

TABLE 2

TOTAL DISCRETE UNITS RECEIVED BY

THE HIGH SCHOOLS - FALL 1978

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Discretes Received
Abraham Lincoln	4.18
* Alex Hamilton	3.80
* Automotive	13.27
Bay Ridge	8.34
Boys and Girls	12.49
Brooklyn Tech.	9.51
Bushwick	9.90
Canarsie	3.90
Clara Barton	7.84
Eastern District	6.58
* East New York	7.65
Edward R. Murrow	4.11
* Eli Whitney	5.40
Erasmus Hall	9.05
Fort Hamilton	4.53
F.D. Roosevelt	6.37
Franklin K. Lane	7.34
* Geo. Westinghouse	6.21
Geo. W. Wingate	8.33
James Madison	8.13
John Dewey	37.43
John Jay	9.89
Lafayette	5.02
Midwood	5.41
New Utrecht	6.89
Prospect Heights	7.54
Samuel J. Tilden	5.31
Sarah J. Hale	13.31
Sheepshead Bay	4.37
South Shore	6.37
Thomas Jefferson	19.15
* Wm. E. Grady	5.52
* Wm. H. Maxwell	6.09
	(279.73)

High School	Discretes Received
Andrew Jackson	7.24
August Martin	10.17
* Aviation	20.77
Bayside	4.07
Beach Channel	5.05
Benj. N. Cardozo	4.58
Far Rockaway	4.59
Flushing	8.49
Forest Hills	3.00
Francis Lewis	3.93
Grover Cleveland	5.70
Hillcrest	8.23
Jamaica	15.99
John Adams	9.79
John Bowne	7.25
Long Island City	6.25
Martin Van Buren	3.93
Newtown	11.92
* Queens	4.77
Richmond Hill	7.78
Springfield Gdns.	5.25
* Thomas A. Edison	6.24
William C. Bryant	6.02
	(171.01)
* Art and Design	4.21
Benjamin Franklin	7.19
Chas E. Hughes	7.51
* Chelsea	2.33
* Fashion Industries	2.15
George Washington	13.27
H.S. Music & Art	12.05
Julia Richman	13.64
Louis D. Brandeis	20.72
* Mabel D. Bacon	10.54
* Manhattan	4.70
Martin L. King Jr.	5.72
Murry Bergtraum	4.30
* N.Y. Printing	8.61
Norman Thomas	7.69
Park West	17.17
Seward Park	13.05
Stuyvesant	5.57
Washington Irving	3.90
	(164.32)

High School	Discretes Received
Adlai Stevenson	8.06
* Alfred E. Smith	7.47
Bronx H.S. Science	9.87
C. Columbus	5.37
DeWitt Clinton	6.11
Evander Childs	4.84
* Grace Dodge	6.15
Harry S. Truman	4.39
Herbert Lehman	8.81
James Monroe	14.21
* Jane Addams	6.85
John F. Kennedy	6.99
Morris	12.60
* Samuel Gompers	7.97
South Bronx	2.26
Theo. Roosevelt	14.46
Walton	6.03
William H. Taft	11.65
	(144.09)
Curtis	10.62
New Dorp	4.19
Port Richmond	11.15
* Ralph McKee	10.98
Susan E. Wagner	4.74
Tottenville	8.30
	(49.93)
	(809.13)

Although we were unable to discern the actual process for allocating discrete units at the borough level, it does appear that some type of monitoring and evaluation takes place for the Division discrete units. For specific programs, the number of allotments divided among the schools involved in that program are listed, with the reported division of how the school has used the units in the past year (percents for instruction, curriculum and supervision, and OTPS). Recommendations are made by the Administrative Assistant on whether there is any duplication of effort, whether pupil period credits have accrued to schools in connection with greater curriculum indices than they would otherwise have had, and whether those fractions of units which were alloted in the past to plan the programs are still being requested for planning.

We feel that the discrete units can provide added flexibility to the schools, particularly for initiating innovative programs or solving specific problems that exist in certain schools. Particularly within the boroughs, however, we would like to point out the needed monitoring and evaluation of how discretes are used, to insure that there is a strong basis for the request and that these units are used to supplement programs that have sound strategies and objectives. As programs are developed and funded year after year, for example, the units allocated for planning these programs should be shifted to other areas. And, if indeed the specific problem has been solved through the allocating of units in the past, these units should also be channeled to new areas of concern.

Thus, we recognize the importance of maintaining the discrete units, but recommend that the Division and superintendents improve their evaluating and monitoring of the use of these units.

VII. DIVISION OF HIGH SCHOOL: OFFICE OF HIGH SCHOOL PROJECTS

In this time of fiscal crisis, many of the schools are looking to other sources for funding. Although these funds are not a part of the unit allocation formula, they allow the principal additional flexibility in using the allocated units. Therefore, we would like to encourage the search for these funds, and point out the assistance available at the Central Division of High Schools in finding monies.

One of the most impressive groups interviewed at the Division of High Schools was the Office of High School Projects, responsible for reimbursable programs.

Reimbursable programs, primarily Title I and PSEN, are designed to supplement, not supplant, the offerings at the high school. The rule of thumb suggested by the Central Office to determine if the programs are truly supplementary is "Can you run your school without it?" Title I programs represent targeted monies centrally administered and allocated to meet the needs of the high schools as expressed by the principal and approved by the Parents Advisory Committee. (PSEN funds are part of the unit allocation). These funds are aimed at improving basic skills. Generally, students in Title I or PSEN programs can have one after school program, such as the peer tutoring program, and as ! , as three remedial classes a day, (reading, math and English as a second language) in addition to their regular tax levy English and math courses. These programs are designed for schools and students who fulfill specific qualifications, and must be used for these students. The Central Division assured us that there is some leeway in the fact that now Title I teachers can teach official classes and have administrative periods, and some of the supplies or physical areas used for these programs can be used by

the school for tax levy programs when not in use for Title I activities.

FUNDS FOR MIDDLE INCOME SCHOOLS

As Title I and PSEN are for specific groups of students, some of the high schools do not qualify for funds from either program. However, there are additional monies available to the middle income schools, Office of High School Projects sends out a monthly bulletin to describe what types of funds are available.

Aside from generally informing the schools of additional funds through this bulletin, there are field supervisors in the boroughs for reimbursable programs who visit and observe non-Title I schools to assist them in determining what potential sources they might use. For example, mini-grants (Under $3,000) are available under Title IV-C, which are open to competition throughout the nation as well as other grants up to $50,000. This year, the Central Office hopes to get fifty such programs funded. Last year twenty-six were funded, and of these, twenty-two were written with assistance from the Office of High School Projects. Title IV-B grants are being used in the high schools for guidance purposes, with twenty-seven schools examining the effect of increased guidance for 150 students per school who are identified as potential drop-outs. Title IV-C currently provides funds for some specialized programs in law or environmental education, and a grant from the Federal Office of the Gifted and Talented is funding a program at the Bronx High School of Science, one of three such programs in the nation to be awarded monies. Not only does the Office of High School Projects help in applying for the grants, but they also assist with any administrative difficulties a school may encounter once the grant is awarded. They are able to provide these services through the use of the budgeted indirect costs from the title programs, providing

for an administrative support system.

With the combined efforts of principals and the staff at the Office of High School Projects, many schools have been successful in receiving additional funds from non tax levy sources. This office has an impressive record in writing award winning applications, and we feel that all the high schools should make even greater use of their expertise with applying for federal, state and other non tax levy monies and in examining programs that might provide additional funding for particular needs within their schools.

VIII. STATE MANDATES REGARDING LIBRARIANS

The New York State Commissioner of Education has recently established regulations regarding the employment of library media specialists, who are included within the unit allocation formula. All New York City high schools are in compliance with this regulation, which states that:

> "In a secondary school with an enrollment of more than 700 but less than 1,000 pupils, a certified school library media specialist shall devote at least five school periods each day to school library work.
>
> In a secondary school with an enrollment of more than 700 but less than 1,000 pupils, a certified school library media specialist shall devote the entire school day to school library work.
>
> One additional full-time assistant certified library media specialist shall be employed in each secondary school for each additional 1,000 pupils enrolled in such school."[9]

A librarian represents one unit, and for some schools, the mandated number of librarians seems to be an unnecessary burden. Of the academic high schools, nine schools have four or more librarians,

and, as these librarians do not provide classroom services, this often places hardships on the schools in having enough teachers to staff their classes. Other schools may indeed need larger library staffs. Certainly, the services that the librarians can provide are valuable: teaching and reviewing basic reference tools and other resources in relation to specific curriculum needs and assignments; developing skills in acquiring information through reading and the interpretation of graphs and charts as part of a reference problem; and assisting students in developing skills in selecting from a variety of multi-media resources and making the most effective use of selected materials.[2] However, the question arises as to whether the State requirement is too rigid, and whether other considerations beside the register of the school should be used to indicate library staffing needs.

We recommend that the State mandate be altered to better reflect the potential utilization of the library for each school. Rather than using the size of the student body, we suggest that the physical size of the library, its current use, or the number of courses in a school requiring library work be factors in requiring specific numbers of certified librarians, possibly assisted by paras. We certainly encourage the increased usage of the library and reference materials by all the high school students, feel that, with the current budget restrictions already limiting the resources available, the emphasis should be on teachers who can spend time in the classroom, and this requirement reduces the units available for classroom teachers for some schools.

NOTES

1. Educational Priorities Panel, Bidding and Purchasing: A Management Study of the Bureau of Pupil Transportation, Bureau of Supplies and the Office of School Food Services, May 31, 1978, p. 17, (transportation contracts excluded).

2. A Master Requirement Contract is an agreement between the Board of Education and vendors to provide materials or services to any school or operating unit in the school system. They are for a specified period of time and include the unit of measure, price per unit, specifications, and an estimate of the quantity that will be ordered.

3. Educational Priorities Panel, p. 29.

4. Ibid., p. i.

5. Ibid., p. 28.

6. Figure from the Division of High Schools, Board of Education.

7. Conversation with Stan Klein, Division of High Schools.

8. Board of Education of the City of New York, Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance, BEVG Memorandum No. 6, June 6, 1978, p. 2.

9. New York City Board of Education, "Special Circular #7, 1978-79, Staffing Library Media Centers in Secondary Schools," August 30, 1978.

CHAPTER IV

CONTRACT PROVISIONS

> Persons trained in a specified skill and with a professional mystique of independence desire an active role in defining the setting and manner in which they will perform their jobs. Teachers believe they know better than others how many children can effectively be taught in a single classroom, how many consecutive hours one can teach effectively, what kinds of intensive programs are most suitable to children with learning deficiencies, how many handicapped children can be absorbed into a "mainstream" class, etc. While it has been mildly funny to observe that none of their expert knowledge has ever led professionals to advocate more work or larger responsibilities, the basis of their claims has often been honored. We will see in looking more specifically at the New York City case, that teacher contracts have come to impact on educational services in many ways beyond the financial![1]

This type of impact became evident in our discussions with high school principals, where there was agreement that the UFT contract itself placed restrictions on how they could best use their resources. If there were the option of increasing these resources, the problem would not be so crucial. But, during this time of fiscal constraints, the principal must look at other ways to increase productivity within a fixed budget in order to best meet the needs of students. One of the options that should be available to him/her is the determination of appropriate class size.

I. CLASS SIZE

Currently, the contract sets across the board restrictions on class sizes, depending on the type of class: thirty-four (34) students for

regular subject classes; fifty (50) for physical education and minor music; and twenty-eight (28) for trade shop and practical arts. Looking at the class sizes for all the schools and discussing this issue with the principals, however, demonstrated that there are a substantial number of oversized classes. In Fall, 1977, there were 15,463 subject classes (not including special education, physical education, minor music) with more than 34 students, or 31.36% of the classes.[2]

It is impossible to determine from the available data the reasons these oversized classes are permitted. It may be because of students listed on paper but not in attendance. Grievances are based on the number of students actually in class. At schools where attendance is a problem, the number of students on register may exceed the maximum, while no more than 34 students are ever actually present

There are also two exceptions to the maximum class size permitted by contract.

1. Singleton Class - There is only one section or one class for a specific course.

2. Half-Size Rule - The number of extra students in all oversized classes for a course does not equal 17, i.e., the newly formed class would not reach the level of half the maximum class size.

If these exceptions are permissable from an educational standpoint, then the question rises as to the validity of the current class size restriction. It would appear to be more educationally sound for the principal to be able to determine what specific classes should be small, and what classes can accomodate a larger number of students without diminishing the educational level. There are certain high level math courses for example, which might require a small class size to best teach the students difficult concepts. At the same time, there are remedial math

courses which should be small to allow more individual attention to the slower learners, thus improving their chances of understanding the basic concepts. We feel that the principal would be in the best position to decide what is needed in specific situations, after examining the student body, the course offerings and consulting with his staff, rather than the contract setting across the board restrictions on class size. At the very least, the current contractual class size should be examined for its educational value in the high school curriculum.

Another consideration in the area of class size is the fact that grievances are settled according to the number of students actually in a classroom, as opposed to the number of students registered for the class. We are concerned that, although this may enable a principal to meet the contract restrictions, the students that might attend if they were encouraged to do so may not be inclined to come to a class in which they are perceived as an additional burden. If there are no books or desks for the "extra" students, the student with some attendance difficulties may just give up. Certainly if the school does not expect them to attend, this attitude becomes evident and, consequently, the expectation is met. The class register, then, should be based on the students who regularly attend, not on live bodies for one day, so that all the students could have the facilities to be encouraged to come daily. Those students with major truancy problems should be withdrawn from regular class roles, according to the present Division policy, and not carried on class registers in the hope that they don't attend. However, students who are withdrawn from regular subject classes should not be given paper schedules or dumped into huge special sections. They must be given the services and attention that

can most appropriately address their needs, in the form of guidance, attendance services, family paras, special classes, etc.

Lastly, the grievance procedure should be timed to accurately reflect the audited register, as of October 31. Often grievances are initiated and then dropped after the audited register is computed, and this timing change would eliminate unnecessary paperwork and procedures.

II. USE OF TEACHER TIME

Realizing that the City's general fiscal problems affect the high schools, and that any funds made available by declining enrollment are absorbed by budget cuts, a massive effort should be made to increase productivity. With this in mind we examined the use of teacher time. A 1978 study of the Office of the Comptroller of the City of New York found that the average teacher in an academic high school actually teaches 56% of his/her six hour and twenty minute work day.[3] The remaining time is spent on administrative, in lieu, or preparation periods. A detailed discussion of the possibility of non pedagogues performing some of these tasks can be found in Chapter II.

III. PREPARATION PERIODS

Regarding the contract provisions, we would like to suggest that some reduction of non-instructional preparation periods could be made. "Preparation periods, as defined by the contract and supported by arbitration findings, are actually free periods."[4] The time cannot be used for "regularly programmed responsibility. Teachers are expected to utilize their professional preparation time in such manner as to enable them to further their professional work for the purpose of their greater classroom effectiveness."[5] What this means is that this period cannot be used for

faculty meetings, to meet with students, or develop course material. Many teachers volunteer to use these periods for such purposes, but they cannot be required to do so. The 1978 Community School Board Negotiating Council suggested that at least one preparation period every week should be available for such purposes as regular or ad hoc non-classroom assignments, contributing to such goals as improved intra- and inter-school communication, staff development, or experimentation.[6] Thus, a teacher's time could be made more productive at no additional cost and little effort on the teacher's behalf.

IV. 35% RULE AND ADDITIONAL WORKDAYS

There are other provisions that affect both the level of productivity and the flexibility a principal has in running his or her school. One is that no more than 35% of home room teachers, or those teachers with official classes, may be given administrative assignments. As each high school teacher must be assigned five administrative periods per week, 65% of the home room teachers in each school are receiving five more free periods. By eliminating this provision, it is estimated that a saving could be made of $15 million.[7] In addition, if the teachers were present for three days prior to the opening of schools to assist in setting up the schools, and one day after the school year closes in order to be available for students, and available to students after school for an extra five hours per month, the estimated productivity gain would be $41 million.[8] During our interviews, principals raised this issue, referring to the difficulties of preparing for the opening of the school year with little assistance and much last minute information.

According to the latest agreement with the UFT, teachers who have home room assignments no longer have the responsibility for sending post cards to the families of truant students. Home room may offer the possibility to establish an important personal contact with a student, and to demonstrate that someone is aware and concerned about a student's attendance. This is discouraged if home room teachers merely go through the mechanics of taking roll and forwarding the statistics to someone else. An opportunity to deter truancy at an early stage is missed.

V. SENIORITY AND FLEXIBILITY

Two other factors in the contract that should be examined to increase productivity in the schools are seniority and rotation. Both of these serve to reduce the flexibility a principal has in structuring the curriculum. Control over assignments to certain classes and administrative tasks offers an opportunity for a supervisor to make the most of his or her available staff, and this control should be available to the principal. Seniority should be used as a consideration but not a determinant of teacher assigment, as the senior teacher is not predictably either the most or least effective member of the staff, and therefor the use of seniority as a basis for assignment has a somewhat random effect on the quality and social distribution of education.

Perhaps more importantly, however, seniority has an impact on the types of courses a principal can offer to his or her students. Often, innovative programs are started by less senior teachers, who then may have to be excessed the next year. Course offerings are also affected by the rotation provision of the contract, preventing a principal from making the best use out of specific talents of teaching personnel. The rotation rule involves assignments to official classes, special and honor

classes, and auxiliary buildings. Those teachers with specific experiences who then start programs in the schools have to be rotated out of those programs after a fixed period of time, and often this causes the dismantling of new course offerings.

It is not the purpose of this study to examine the UFT contract and its provisions. However,we feel that because these contractual restrictions do affect the use of units in the allocation formula, a brief discussion is in order. In addition, our interviews with the principals indicated that the contract provides restrictions on managing their schools, in addition to the imposed budget constraints. An increased flexibility in the areas discussed would substantially increase a principal's capacity to address the needs of the student body. For this reason, we feel that the above provisions, which either limit a principal's ability to effectively allocate personnel or restrict educational services, should be amended.

NOTES

1. Silbiger, Sara L. Collective Bargaining and the Distribution of Education Benefits in New York City. Paper prepared for delivery at the 1978 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Aug. 31 - Sept. 3, 1978, p. 8.

2. Board of Education, Division of High Schools Comparative Analysis of the Organization of the High Schools. The Fall Term, 1977. p. 39-40.

3. The City of New York, Office of the Comptroller, Technical Analysis of the Use of In-School Teaching Time in the High Schools. Oct. 12, 1978, p. 25.

4. Silbiger, S. p. 19

5. Agreements between the Board of Education City School District of the City of New York and UFT, Sept. 9, 1975 to Sept. 9, 1977, Article 7A 2b(7)

6. List submitted by the Community School Board Negotiating Council to the Board of Education on March 8, 1978.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

CHAPTER V

DISINCENTIVES WITHIN THE FORMULA TO IMPROVE ATTENDANCE

One of the major concerns to all those involved in the field of education is improving attendance in the schools. This is particularly true in New York City, where the attendance rate is among the lowest in the nation, and the social consequences of children not attending school are particularly severe.

Dr. Macchiarola, in his September 29, 1978 memorandum to the Board of Education, stated that:

> "...the rate of attendance at our schools is an important indication of their effectiveness in meeting the needs of the students they serve... To insure commitment to more strenuous attendance programs, we must provide the necessary resources in terms of personnel, expertise and automation and other technical services. And, in the long run, we must reward the successful application of these programs with additional resources and positive performance evaluations."[1]

He set forth a program that we would like to see implemented. We fully support the concept that attendance is a serious problem within the high school system, and improving it should be a priority of every high school principal.

An examination of the rates of attendance for the years 1975-76 through 1977-78, as seen in Table 1, demonstrates some improvement over this period. Eighty-one of the schools increased their attendance over these three years, and eighteen of these increases were by more than five percent. The problem arises, however, when one looks at the attendance increase from 1975-76 to 1976-77. An improvement of even 4.05%, for example, may mean that a school increases its attendance from 64.4% to

TABLE 1

ATTENDANCE RATE

1975 - 1978

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	1975/76	1976/77	1977/78	Gain or Loss 1975/76 - 1977/78
Abraham Lincoln	76.95	77.87	77.62	+.67
* Alex Hamilton	78.71	68.27	73.70	-5.01
* Automotive	80.70	80.11	81.36	+.66
Bay Ridge	64.04	64.58	68.85	+4.81
Boys and Girls	55.01	60.08	62.84	+7.83
Brooklyn Tech.	81.20	83.26	87.47	+6.27
Bushwick	65.36	63.21	64.39	-.97
Canarsie	71.55	72.33	72.66	+1.11
Clara Barton	85.26	85.25	90.71	+5.45
Eastern District	61.96	56.17	58.18	-3.78
* East New York	70.83	72.33	78.56	+7.73
Edward R. Murrow	80.48	83.02	83.43	+2.95
* Eli Whitney	76.44	75.99	81.82	+5.38
Erasmus Hall	75.01	76.01	78.40	+3.39
Fort Hamilton	75.55	78.84	79.89	+4.34
F.D. Roosevelt	58.79	64.75	72.89	+14.1
Franklin K. Lane	60.68	63.24	65.09	+4.41
* Geo. Westinghouse	79.62	81.68	86.16	+6.54
Geo. W. Wingate	77.73	73.15	76.24	-1.49
James Madison	76.67	74.57	73.48	-3.19
John Dewey	81.71	82.12	83.39	+1.68
John Jay	57.99	57.26	60.97	+2.98
Lafayette	67.95	70.79	74.18	+6.23
Midwood	79.02	81.30	83.02	+4.00
New Utrecht	65.24	69.04	72.18	+6.94
Prospect Heights	66.97	67.47	68.25	+1.28
Samuel J. Tilden	75.56	78.41	80.38	+4.82
Sarah J. Hale	67.07	64.97	67.35	+.30
Sheepshead Bay	76.03	75.55	76.05	+.02
South Shore	73.44	72.26	75.73	+2.29
Thomas Jefferson	55.71	56.44	59.80	+4.09
* Wm. E. Grady	74.71	77.02	79.80	+5.09
* Wm. H. Maxwell	74.71	75.76	76.16	+1.45

High School	1975/76	1976/77	1977/78	Gain or Loss 1975/76 - 1977/78
Andrew Jackson	74.71	73.22	72.79	-1.92
August Martin	85.29	85.51	87.30	+2.01
* Aviation	85.68	89.20	89.95	+4.27
Bayside	79.24	81.01	82.10	+2.86
Beach Channel	80.13	79.12	81.94	+1.81
Benj. N. Cardozo	82.02	79.00	82.17	+.15
Far Rockaway	77.03	73.96	73.87	-3.16
Flushing	76.93	78.15	80.53	+3.6
Forest Hills	86.14	85.00	86.48	+.34
Francis Lewis	77.94	77.65	85.50	+7.56
Grover Cleveland	77.04	76.63	78.58	+1.54
Hillcrest	78.93	80.88	81.08	+2.15
Jamaica	83.17	86.23	86.95	+3.78
John Adams	76.13	75.18	73.63	-2.5
John Bowne	77.82	77.91	81.03	+3.21
Long Island City	83.22	83.49	86.35	+3.13
Martin Van Buren	82.04	81.70	85.96	+3.92
Newtown	80.89	83.93	87.57	+6.68
* Queens	80.27	77.22	78.00	-2.27
Richmond Hill	75.85	73.85	78.70	+3.57
Springfield Gdns.	76.13	78.92	78.49	+2.36
* Thomas A. Edison	83.13	84.09	87.55	+4.42
William C. Bryant	72.56	75.53	79.31	+6.75
* Art and Design	85.88	83.92	84.30	-1.58
Benjamin Franklin	53.11	58.45	61.34	+8.23
Chas E. Hughes	61.85	59.98	63.13	+1.28
* Chelsea	79.56	78.78	76.58	-2.98
* Fashion Industries	79.63	84.11	86.63	+7
George Washington	63.53	66.56	73.00	+9.47
H.S. Music & Art	82.58	83.12	82.35	-.23
Julia Richman	70.16	72.17	73.18	+3.02
Louis D. Brandeis	82.14	82.78	79.68	-2.46
* Mabel D. Bacon	82.93	84.64	86.74	+3.81
* Manhattan	65.12	60.88	61.80	-3.32
Martin L. King Jr.	73.90	71.31	75.12	+1.22
Murry Bergtraum	82.43	86.65	87.97	+5.54
* N.Y. Printing	74.88	72.88	75.88	+1.00
Norman Thomas	79.28	80.85	83.53	+4.25
Haaran	57.95	59.53	61.28	+3.33
Seward Park	71.42	76.96	75.44	+4.02
Stuyvesant	87.33	87.56	92.16	+4.83
Washington Irving	71.41	69.45	72.07	+.66
Food & Maritime	67.10	66.94	64.91	-2.19

High School	1975/76	1976/77	1977/78	Gain or Loss 1975/76 - 1977/78
Adlai Stevenson	73.06	71.61	73.45	+.39
* Alfred E. Smith	72.67	71.87	77.14	+4.47
Bronx H.S. Science	87.86	87.72	89.29	+1.43
C. Columbus	72.27	70.60	76.89	+4.62
DeWitt Clinton	56.83	59.95	61.01	+4.18
Evander Childs	72.14	72.20	72.08	-.06
* Grace Dodge	83.00	83.93	85.52	+2.52
Harry S. Truman	76.59	78.58	76.47	-.12
Herbert Lehman	73.08	69.52	70.70	-2.38
James Monroe	64.40	67.62	68.45	+4.05
* Jane Addams	75.55	70.23	71.24	-4.31
John F. Kennedy	71.05	69.74	74.45	+3.40
Morris	66.80	67.28	69.23	+2.43
* Samuel Gompers	81.74	77.86	74.18	-7.56
South Bronx	-	-	74.53	-
Theo. Roosevelt	60.88	59.07	67.97	+7.09
Walton	63.46	64.61	66.28	+2.82
William H. Taft	61.02	59.73	59.43	+1.59
Curtis	78.57	77.37	79.56	+.99
New Dorp	75.03	76.54	78.04	+3.01
Port Richmond	81.90	82.18	82.22	+.32
* Ralph McKee	71.70	76.38	79.16	+7.46
Susan E. Wagner	77.57	76.78	80.47	+2.9
Tottenville	82.45	82.51	84.68	+2.23

68.45%, still having a low attendance rate. Even the one school that increases its attendance by 14% still only had a 72.89% attendance rate. In 1977-78, only 18 of the 99 high schools had a daily attendance rate above 85%.

I. ATTENDANCE AND THE FORMULA

Currently. attendance is given consideration in the unit allocation formula with the exclusion of long-term absentees. Long-term absentees (LTA's) are those students who have not attended school any day during the first two months of any given semester. "Adjusted register" refers to the fact that these students are not included in the register for allocation purposes.

However, despite this sanction. there are two ways in which the formula provides disincentives to increasing attendance.

A. LONG TERM ABSENTEES (LTA's)

It is difficult to understand the problem of LTA's. There is not even a standard definition. An LTA at the Division of High Schools becomes a "no-show" at the Office of Educational Statistics. Even within the Division of High Schools policy varies. While students are not removed from the register for allocation purposes until they are absent for two consecutive months, they are removed from subject classes after one month, according to divisional policy. However. practice varies from school to school. In the Fall of 1978, forty-eight schools had more students unenrolled in subject classes than the number of LTA's, as of October 31. While there were schools who had the reverse situation, and had not as yet removed LTA's from subject classes, there were 928 more students city-wide unenrolled in subject classes than there were LTA's (Table 2). This means that students are included on the allocation

register. and funds are allotted for their education, and they are not provided with classroom services.

In addition, for those students not included on the allocation register, there is no fiscal incentive to bring an LTA back into the school system. Since no funds are provided for LTA's, if an LTA student does return and services are provided, either guidance or instruction, this is not reflected in the allocation formula until the following semester. These services must be taken from the limited units provided for those students on the register. One cannot expect the schools to do anything for their LTA's unless they are given specific funding for this purpose.

B. INTERMITTENT ABSENTEEISM

Most of the students with attendance problems are not LTA's, but rather students who either attend several times a week, but not regularly, or do not attend all of their classes daily. Of forty students registered for a class, thirty may attend daily, however, there is a different mix of students each day.

This situation is tolerated in part because of the difficulty of meeting both contract restrictions and severe budgetary constraints. The formula is computed so as to provide sufficient class coverage for the school with only minimal padding (the average class size is set at 31.5 rather than the maximum of 34). However, in order to meet the city-wide decrease in available funds, a below-the-line cut is taken, with each school's units decreased by a certain percent. This cut not only absorbs the leeway built into the formula, but presents the principal with less units than he/she needs to maintain the curriculum index and meet the teacher contract provisions for maximum class size (the below-the-line

cut for Fall 1978 was 11.6%, and the cut has been as high as 20% in the past.[2]) Each principal has been forced to discover ways of dealing with this "Catch-22" situation. Unfortunately, one of the ways has a a discouraging affect on attendance.

Class-size grievances are settled on the basis of "live bodies," as discussed in Chapter IV. A high truancy rate may offer a principal an easy answer to the combined pressures of a restricted budget and a rigorous teacher contract. There is no fiscal incentive to increase class attendance to the point at which more classes would be required, without a similar increase in funds. There are students with so-called "paper schedules," who are enrolled in grossly oversized classes with the assumption that they will not attend, an assumption that may be self-fulfilling. Students do recognize the intent of an oversized class, especially if there are insufficient supplies and space greeting their unexpected arrival. Students who already have an attendance problem are likely to respond to such a situation by continuing to absent themselves.

TABLE 2

FALL 1978 - ATTENDANCE AND LTA's

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	% Attendance 1977-78	A # LTA's 10/31/78	% Adjusted Audited Register=LTA's	B # Students Unenrolled in Subject Classes 10/31/78	A-B
Abraham Lincoln	77.62	114	4.03	114	0
* Alex Hamilton	73.70	3	.24	7	-4
* Automotive	81.36	29	1.71	29	0
Bay Ridge	68.85	204	8.68	204	0
Boys and Girls	62.84	575	12.51	153	+422
Brooklyn Tech.	87.47	59	1.01	59	0
Bushwick	64.39	170	5.81	170	0
Canarsie	72.66	34	1.33	102	-68
Clara Barton	90.71	11	.47	11	0
Eastern District	58.18	549	18.13	674	-125
* East New York	78.56	20	1.20	0	+20
Edward R. Murrow	83.43	1	.04	8	-7
* Eli Whitney	81.82	97	4.21	160	-63
Erasmus Hall	78.40	179	4.40	157	+22
Fort Hamilton	79.89	168	4.49	168	0
F.D. Roosevelt	72.89	64	1.66	309	-245
Franklin K. Lane	65.09	355	6.90	438	-83
* Geo. Westinghouse	86.16	38	1.67	2	+36
Geo. W. Wingate	76.24	145	4.32	201	-56
James Madison	73.48	27	.85	49	-22
John Dewey	83.39	9	.27	36	-27
John Jay	60.97	456	10.37	456	0
Lafayette	74.18	214	6.20	300	-86
Midwood	83.02	178	6.24	236	-58
New Utrecht	72.18	35	1.28	35	0
Prospect Heights	68.25	265	8.41	369	-104
Samuel J. Tilden	80.38	77	2.74	81	-4
Sarah J. Hale	67.35	136	5.35	220	-84
Sheepshead Bay	76.05	49	1.63	49	0
South Shore	75.73	108	2.43	108	0
Thomas Jefferson	59.80	255	6.54	255	0
* Wm. E. Grady	79.80	71	3.29	71	0
* Wm. H. Maxwell	76.16	70	3.84	82	-12
		(4,765)		(5,313)	(-548)

High School	% Attendance 1977-78	A # LTA's 10/31/78	% Adjusted Audited Register=LTA's	B # Students Unenrolled in Subject Classes 10/31/78	A-B
Andrew Jackson	72.79	38	1.43	80	-42
August Martin	87.30	33	1.68	43	-10
* Aviation	89.95	22	.81	34	-12
Bayside	82.10	30	.82	67	-37
Beach Channel	81.94	1	.03	7	-6
Benj. N. Cardozo	82.17	79	2.62	121	-42
Far Rockaway	73.87	14	.65	52	-38
Flushing	80.53	53	2.05	55	-2
Forest Hills	86.48	40	1.73	56	-16
Francis Lewis	85.50	9	.31	31	-22
Grover Cleveland	78.58	35	.88	35	0
Hillcrest	81.08	37	1.21	67	-30
Jamaica	81.95	17	.55	17	0
John Adams	73.63	221	4.64	221	0
John Bowne	81.03	151	3.92	151	0
Long Island City	86.35	49	1.51	0	+49
Martin Van Buren	85.96	0	0	8	-8
Newtown	87.57	72	1.58	101	-29
* Queens	78.00	43	3.43	23	+20
Richmond Hill	78.70	80	2.94	80	0
Springfield Gdns.	78.49	81	2.57	167	-86
* Thomas A. Edison	87.55	23	.99	44	-21
William C. Bryant	79.31	132	3.47	132	0
		(1,260)		(1,592)	(-332)
* Art and Design	84.30	11	.48	-	+11
Benjamin Franklin	61.34	350	16.55	118	+232
Chas E. Hughes	63.13	383	14.58	383	0
* Chelsea	76.58	74	6.64	77	-3
* Fashion Industries	86.63	25	1.04	47	-22
George Washington	73.00	129	4.07	179	-50
H.S. Music & Art	82.35	52	2.08	52	0
Julia Richman	73.18	244	7.17	221	+23
Louis D. Brandeis	79.68	166	4.06	71	+95
* Mabel D. Bacon	86.74	23	1.80	27	-4
* Manhattan	61.80	217	12.67	286	-69
Martin L. King Jr.	75.12	93	3.78	93	0
Murry Bergtraum	87.97	37	1.46	11	+26
* N.Y. Printing	75.88	160	8.67	194	-34
Norman Thomas	83.53	73	2.41	90	-17
Park West [1]	-	540	14.35	231	+309
Seward Park	75.44	543	14.33	639	-96
Stuyvesant	92.16	8	.29	-	+8
Washington Irving	72.07	61	2.54	175	-114
		(3,189)		(2,894)	(+295)

[1] Park West was not open for the 1977-78 school year.

High School	% Attendance 1977-78	A # LTA's 10/31/78	% Adjusted Audited Register=LTA's	B # Students Unenrolled in Subject Classes 10/31/78	A-B
Adlai Stevenson	73.45	165	3.85	165	0
* Alfred E. Smith	77.14	61	3.48	61	0
Bronx H.S. Science	89.29	16	.48	17	-1
C. Columbus	76.89	96	3.17	155	-59
DeWitt Clinton	61.01	196	4.74	323	-127
Evander Childs	72.08	477	13.01	604	-127
* Grace Dodge	85.52	24	1.23	24	0
Harry S. Truman	76.47	15	.46	53	-38
Herbert Lehman	70.70	229	6.92	220	+9
James Monroe	68.45	210	7.86	274	-64
* Jane Addams	71.24	39	2.54	39	0
John F. Kennedy	74.45	145	3.08	210	-65
Morris	69.23	317	11.46	400	-83
* Samuel Gompers	74.18	-	-	0	0
South Bronx	74.53	132	16.69	143	-11
Theo. Roosevelt	67.97	489	11.18	584	-95
Walton	66.28	222	6.72	34	+188
William H. Taft	59.43	124	3.25	124	0
		(2,957)		(3,430)	(-473)
Curtis	79.52	28	1.23	0	+28
New Dorp	78.04	108	3.90	108	0
Port Richmond	82.22	28	.95	28	0
* Ralph McKee	79.16	32	2.40	32	0
Susan E. Wagner	80.47	42	1.44	48	-6
Tottenville	84.68	66	1.36	66	0
		(304)		(282)	(+22)
TOTAL		12,475		13,511	-1,036

II. PROPOSALS TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR INCREASED ATTENDANCE

Two proposals have been put forward which would revise the allocation formula to reflect attendance. However, under careful examination, it appears that neither would have the desired effect. Before presenting an alternative, it is necessary to consider the proposals presented by various organizations within the high school community.

A. PROPOSAL BY THE SPECIALIZED HIGH SCHOOLS

The specialized high schools are those which base admission on a rigorous City-wide test or audition. These include Stuyvesant High School, Brooklyn Technical High School, The Bronx High School of Science, and Fiorello H. LaGuardia High School (Performing Arts and Music and Art).

Because these schools have high attendance rates, 92.16%, 87.47%, 89.29% and 82.32% respectively for 1977-78, (see Table 1) and must provide in-class services to virtually all the students on the register, they support the use of attendance as a basis for receiving additional units. They feel that, because the allotment formula does not take attendance into account, dollars per pupil attending is less in schools with high attendance. The gap is further widened by the PSEN and reimbursable programs, and, the instructional need for small classes and added guidance needs in the special schools should be taken into account. On the basis of these factors, these specialized schools feel that "students in specialized high schools are being denied services to which they are entitled and which students in other schools are receiving."[3] They propose the following: attendance should be used as a basis for receiving additional units. The average attendance for the months of

October, November, February and March would be used as a base, and, for every percent that a given school's attendance exceeds this average, the school should be allowed 0.1 unit per 1,000 students. For those who fall below the average, they should be charged 0.1 unit per 1,000 students.

There is no question that the special schools are a valuable component of our public school system. They should be given every consideration in serving their student body, but not at the expense of other high school students. Let us consider their arguments point by point.

The elimination of long-term absentees from the register used for the allocation already makes attendance a major consideration in the formula. During the fall of 1978, 11 schools had over ten percent of their register listed as LTA's, with one school having as much as eighteen percent LTA's. A total of 12,475 students (4.3% of the total audited register) were designated as LTA's and 13,511 (4.6%) were unenrolled in subject classes. (These are students who are counted for funding, but, because they are absent for one month, they are pulled from regular classes.) Table 2 illustrates the number of students classified as LTA's per school, and all schools which had over ten percent of their register listed as LTA's also had less than a seventy-five percent attendance rate for the previous year. Thus, these schools not only have students who are long-term truants that they receive no funds for, but also have a high percentage of students who may attend school sporadically, and who require extra support personnel to deal with their attendance problems.

Regarding the per pupil expenditure, the specialized high schools, and other schools with high attendance, do receive more than the average per capita allocation (See Table 3). In the existing formula, the Curriculum Index, or the

TABLE 3

FALL 1978 - ACTUAL PER CAPITA ALLOCATION

BASED ON NET UNITS - (DISCRETES + PSEN)

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Adjusted Audited Register Per Capita Allocation	Adjusted Audited Register # Students For 1 Unit	Estimated Register Per Capita Allocation	Estimated Register # Students For Every Unit
Abraham Lincoln	.045721	21.87	.044911	22.27
* Alex Hamilton	.067666	14.78	.055667	17.96
* Automotive	.056315	17.76	.057347	17.44
Bay Ridge	.046569	21.47	.047341	21.12
Boys and Girls	.049316	20.28	.043648	22.91
Brooklyn Tech.	.050733	19.71	.049962	20.02
Bushwick	.038324	26.09	.041338	24.19
Canarsie	.046066	21.71	.046753	21.39
Clara Barton	.052981	18.87	.051994	19.23
Eastern District	.041739	23.96	.040513	24.68
* East New York	.056788	17.61	.057238	17.47
Edward R. Murrow	.051060	19.58	.050981	19.62
* Eli Whitney	.053591	18.66	.053811	18.58
Erasmus Hall	.045698	21.88	.042495	23.53
Fort Hamilton	.042927	23.30	.043622	22.92
F.D. Roosevelt	.042848	23.34	.042325	23.63
Franklin K. Lane	.046002	21.74	.047550	21.03
* Geo. Westinghouse	.057340	17.44	.055453	18.03
Geo. W. Wingate	.043501	22.99	.044457	22.49
James Madison	.043742	22.86	.042285	23.65
John Dewey	.051273	19.50	.050089	19.96
John Jay	.043360	23.06	.042350	23.61
Lafayette	.044938	25.25	.045572	21.95
Midwood	.049593	20.16	.047010	21.27
New Utrecht	.044878	22.28	.044878	22.28
Prospect Heights	.041389	24.16	.042372	23.60
Samuel J. Tilden	.045154	22.15	.045453	22.00
Sarah J. Hale	.049244	20.31	.051135	19.56
Sheepshead Bay	.044308	22.57	.043672	22.90
South Shore	.046588	21.46	.046956	21.30
Thomas Jefferson	.038298	26.11	.039290	25.45
* Wm. E. Grady	.057717	17.33	.055972	17.87
* Wm. H. Maxwell	.053769	18.60	.051061	19.58

High School	Adjusted Audited Register Per Capita Allocation	Adjusted Audited Register # Students For 1 Unit	Estimated Register Per Capita Allocation	Estimated Register # Students For Every Unit
Andrew Jackson	.044769	22.34	.046400	21.55
August Martin	.054912	18.21	.052574	19.02
* Aviation	.054368	18.39	.055538	18.01
Bayside	.046244	21.62	.045562	21.95
Beach Channel	.049080	20.37	.049210	20.32
Benj. N. Cardozo	.047408	21.09	.047087	21.24
Far Rockaway	.046860	21.34	.047210	21.18
Flushing	.047151	21.21	.045725	21.87
Forest Hills	.045882	21.80	.046788	21.37
Francis Lewis	.043694	22.89	.044172	22.64
Grover Cleveland	.043098	23.20	.044436	22.50
Hillcrest	.049429	20.23	.048897	20.45
Jamaica	.048533	20.60	.048675	20.54
John Adams	.043300	23.09	.042829	23.35
John Bowne	.045406	22.02	.044728	22.36
Long Island City	.043234	23.13	.042953	23.28
Martin Van Buren	.045877	21.80	.046098	21.69
Newtown	.042186	23.70	.043210	23.14
* Queens	.062587	15.98	.059210	16.89
Richmond Hill	.048146	20.77	.045587	21.94
Springfield Gdns.	.046211	21.64	.045808	21.83
* Thomas A. Edison	.057088	17.52	.055263	18.10
William C. Bryant	.043070	23.22	.043968	22.74
* Art and Design	.057078	17.52	.056061	17.84
Benjamin Franklin	.036685	27.26	.043253	23.12
Chas E. Hughes	.044991	22.23	.043896	22.78
* Chelsea	.061210	16.34	.059385	16.84
* Fashion Industries	.060386	16.56	.053792	18.59
George Washington	.037545	26.63	.041053	24.36
H.S. Music & Art	.053082	18.84	.053585	18.66
Julia Richman	.040960	24.41	.040574	24.65
Louis D. Brandeis	.042452	23.56	.042549	23.50
* Mabel D. Bacon	.056885	17.58	.055728	17.94
* Manhattan	.054733	18.27	.055587	17.99
Martin L. King Jr.	.047628	21.00	.049274	20.29
Murry Bergtraum	.051657	19.36	.050482	19.81
* N.Y. Printing	.055953	17.87	.057209	17.48
Norman Thomas	.049742	20.10	.050305	19.88
Park West	.039920	25.05	.050224	19.91
Seward Park	.042448	23.56	.042226	23.68
Stuyvesant	.051801	19.30	.051317	19.49
Washington Irving	.047059	21.25	.045747	21.86

High School	Adjusted Audited Register Per Capita Allocation	Adjusted Audited Register # Students For 1 Unit	Estimated Register Per Capita Allocation	Estimated Register # Students For Every Unit
Adlai Stevenson	.042199	23.70	.044490	22.48
* Alfred E. Smith	.058609	17.06	.054633	18.30
Bronx H.S. Science	.051341	19.48	.050291	19.88
C. Columbus	.044167	22.64	.046351	21.57
DeWitt Clinton	.043678	22.89	.043337	23.07
Evander Childs	.041806	23.92	.045008	22.22
* Grace Dodge	.053596	18.66	.053265	18.77
Harry S. Truman	.046927	21.31	.047338	21.12
Herbert Lehman	.043754	22.86	.044787	22.33
James Monroe	.045004	22.22	.045747	21.86
* Jane Addams	.055385	18.06	.054545	18.33
John F. Kennedy	.043805	22.83	.044999	22.22
Morris	.042596	23.48	.045792	21.84
* Samuel Gompers	.058022	17.23	.058964	16.96
South Bronx	.068058	14.69	.062119	16.10
Theo. Roosevelt	.042286	23.65	.042527	23.51
Walton	.045110	22.17	.044405	22.52
William H. Taft	.041878	23.88	.039674	25.21
Curtis	.047441	21.08	.047632	20.99
New Dorp	.047124	21.22	.046221	21.64
Port Richmond	.045653	21.90	.045322	22.06
* Ralph McKee	.059507	16.80	.057989	17.24
Susan E. Wagner	.045938	21.77	.045356	22.05
Tottenville	.047620	21.00	.047402	21.10
AVERAGE	.046948	21.30	.046929	21.31

average number of instructional periods offered daily, is the most important factor in the present allocation formula. Those schools which have historically offered more courses per day are given the resources to continue to do so, while those who have a low curriculum index are awarded fewer units, perpetuating the lower level. Schools with a higher curriculum index, regardless of size, receive more units per capita than those with a low index. The specialized high schools all received funding for 7.0 instructional periods daily, the ceiling imposed by the Division of High Schools. This problem is further discussed in Chapter VII. It is interesting to note that attendance is also related to the Curriculum Index. (See Appendix II for statistical documentations).

Once more, it must be underscored that long term absentees have already been excluded from the allocation registers. Per capita expenditures cannot be figured on the basis of the number of students present daily, but on the total number of students attending school during a semester. Resources and services must be made available for every child. A school must certainly provide services for every child for whom units are allocated. As is demonstrated in Table 3, schools with poor attendance receive less units on a per capita basis, using the adjusted audited register.

Regarding the third point, PSEN funds and other non-competitive reimbursable funds are given to the schools because the targeted students need more resources to teach them the basics of education. The legislation that regulates these programs assumes that in order to ensure a minimum competency level for all students, additional resources must be allocated to some. The bulk of these funds, PSEN (State funds for Pupils with Special Educational Needs) and Federal Title I funds, are child specific and must be used for those students, identified by tests, who

are retarded two or more years in reading and/or math. These funds must be used to supplement, not supplant the City's tax levy contribution, for those students with special needs.

The special high schools do receive additional units, however, in the form of discrete units from either the borough superintendent or executive director of the division of high schools. (This is in addition to the higher per capita funding actually received, which provides for a high curriculum index and increased variety of course offerings.) In the fall of 1978, the specialized schools received over twenty discrete units from the superintendents and the high school division to deal with additional needs not covered by the net staff units allocated. (see Table 2, Chapter IV). There are also other reimbursable funds available to these schools (See Chapter III).

The special high schools feel that some consideration should be given to their needs for smaller classes and additional guidance services. All students have the same worth in human terms, and a small class which provides remediation to students with special needs is as important as a high level language or math class, which is "expensive" because only a handful of students qualify. Likewise, the need for special college counseling is balanced by the counseling needs of other students who may have specific social problems.

B. PROPOSAL BY THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S ASSOCIATION

The High School Principal's Association presented a proposal rewarding those schools with increasing attendance and penalizing those with decreasing attendance. The rate of reward was small (0.003 to 0.005 x the net units), and Tables 4 and 5 show the results of im-

plementing such a program. These computations are based on the assumption that there will be no new money for attendance, and the total units for the high schools would remian constant.

As evidenced by the tables, the changes would be minimal. A total of eight units was required to implement the proposal based on attendance improvement for 1977, necessitating an additional below the line cut of 0.05%. This was low primarily because the actual changes in attendance rates for that year were minimal.

42 schools increased less than 3%
32 schools decreased less than 3%
12 schools increased from 3-5%
7 schools decreased from 3-5%
4 schools increased more than 5%
3 schools decreased more than 5%

So, although this resulted in a minimal below the line cut, it also resulted in very small unit changes. This computation was done again for the 1978 year. The difference between the two years is primarily due to the fact that eighty-three schools increased their attendance instead of fifty-eight, and the decreases were generally at a lower rate than the totals of the previous year.

51 schools increased less than 3%
14 schools decreased less than 3%
20 schools increased from 3-5%
2 schools decreased from 3-5%
12 schools increased more than 5%
0 schools decreased more than 5%

There has been some question as to the validity of the attendance figures, but these two tables show that the increased allocation, whether for small attendance gains or higher gains, are minimal. It should be noted, however, that because an additional below the line cut is needed to furnish the "reward" units, a school with a declining attendance rate

TABLE 4

1977 FALL TERM EVALUATION OF HSPA ATTENDANCE PROPOSAL BASED ON ATTENDANCE FOR 1975-76 AND 1976-77

	Net Staff Units - (PSEN + Discretes)	% Change in Attendance	Adj. Net (A)	Unit Change	New Net - (PSEN + Discretes)	Gain or Loss
* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools						
High School						
Abraham Lincoln	124.19	+ .92	124.12	+ .37	124.49	+ .30
* Alex Hamilton	80.58	-10.44	80.53	- .40	80.13	- .45
* Automotive	91.28	- .59	91.23	- .27	90.96	- .32
Bay Ridge	99.33	+ .54	99.27	+ .30	99.57	+ .24
Boys and Girls	185.52	+ 5.07	185.41	+ .93	186.34	+ .82
Brooklyn Tech.	288.61	+ 2.06	288.44	+ .87	289.31	+ .70
Bushwick	124.10	- 2.15	124.03	- .37	123.66	- .44
Canarsie	124.48	+ .78	124.41	+ .37	124.78	+ .30
Clara Barton	118.25	- .01	118.18	- .36	117.82	- .43
Eastern District	103.65	- 5.79	103.59	- .52	103.07	- .58
* East New York	93.60	+ 1.50	93.54	+ .28	93.82	+ .22
Edward R. Murrow	120.09	+ 2.54	120.02	+ .36	120.38	+ .29
* Eli Whitney	128.47	- .45	128.39	- .39	128.00	- .47
Erasmus Hall	173.24	+ 1.00	173.14	+ .52	173.66	+ .42
Fort Hamilton	163.32	+ 3.29	163.22	+ .65	163.87	+ .55
F.D. Roosevelt	181.11	+ 5.96	181.00	+ .91	181.91	+ .80
Franklin K. Lane	186.89	+ 2.56	186.78	+ .56	187.34	+ .45
* Geo. Westinghouse	110.66	+ 2.06	110.59	+ .33	110.92	+ .26
Geo. W. Wingate	124.72	- 4.58	124.65	- .50	124.15	- .57
James Madison	119.12	- 2.10	119.05	- .36	118.69	- .43
John Dewey	167.02	+ .41	166.92	+ .50	167.42	+ .40
John Jay	168.22	- .73	168.12	- .50	167.62	- .60
Lafayette	153.01	+ 2.84	152.92	+ .46	153.38	+ .37
Midwood	122.94	+ 2.28	122.87	+ .37	123.24	+ .30
New Utrecht	120.90	+ 3.80	120.83	+ .48	121.31	+ .41
Prospect Heights	117.09	+ .05	117.02	+ .35	117.37	+ .28
Samuel J. Tilden	119.01	+ 2.85	118.94	+ .36	119.30	+ .29
Sarah J. Hale	121.72	- 2.10	121.65	- .37	121.28	- .44
Sheepshead Bay	136.81	- .48	136.73	- .41	136.32	- .49
South Shore	207.06	- 1.18	206.94	- .62	206.32	- .74
Thomas Jefferson	149.85	.73	149.76	+ .45	150.21	+ .36
* Wm. E. Grady	116.93	+ 2.31	116.86	+ .35	117.21	+ .28
* Wm. H. Maxwell	91.78	+ 1.05	91.72	+ .28	92.00	+ .22
	(4,533.55)		(4,530.87)	(+4.98)	(4,535.85)	(+ 2.30)

(A) Adjusted Net reflects an additional budget adjustment of .06% to redistribute the units needed to implement the proposal.

High School	Net Staff Units - (PSEN + Discretes)	% Change in Attendance	Adj. Net (A)	Unit Change	New Net - (PSEN + Discretes)	Gain or Loss
Andrew Jackson	114.16	-1.49	114.09	-.34	113.75	-.41
August Martin	93.68	+ .22	93.62	+.28	93.90	+.22
* Aviation	148.78	+3.52	148.69	+.60	149.29	+.51
Bayside	171.08	+1.77	170.98	+.51	171.49	+.41
Beach Channel	168.38	-1.01	168.28	-.51	167.77	-.61
Benj. N. Cardozo	157.24	-3.02	157.15	-.63	156.52	-.72
Far Rockaway	100.17	-3.07	100.11	-.40	99.71	-.46
Flushing	122.09	+1.22	122.02	+.37	122.39	+.30
Forest Hills	121.14	-1.14	121.07	-.36	120.71	-.43
Francis Lewis	129.59	- .29	129.51	-.39	129.12	-.47
Grover Cleveland	195.38	- .41	195.26	-.59	194.67	-.71
Hillcrest	140.47	+1.95	140.39	+.42	140.81	+.34
Jamaica	148.79	+3.06	148.70	+.60	149.30	+.51
John Adams	203.57	- .95	203.45	-.61	202.84	-.73
John Bowne	167.51	+ .09	167.41	+.50	167.91	+.40
Long Island City	124.70	+ .27	124.63	+.37	125.00	+.30
Martin Van Buren	165.36	- .34	165.26	-.50	164.76	-.60
Newtown	201.98	+3.04	201.86	+.81	202.67	+.69
* Queens	74.77	+3.05	74.73	+.30	75.03	+.26
Richmond Hill	123.95	-2.00	123.88	-.37	123.51	-.44
Springfield Gdns.	142.55	+2.79	142.46	+.43	142.89	+.34
* Thomas A. Edison	123.14	+ .96	123.07	+.37	123.44	+.30
William C. Bryant	157.39	+2.97	157.30	+.47	157.77	+.38
Sub-total	(3,295.87)		(3,293.92)	(+1.33)	(3,295.25)	(-.62)
* Art and Design	125.88	-1.96	125.80	-.38	125.42	-.46
Benjamin Franklin	85.23	+5.34	85.18	+.43	85.61	+.38
Chas E. Hughes	81.38	-1.87	81.33	-.24	81.09	-.29
* Chelsea	61.35	- .78	61.31	-.18	61.13	-.22
* Fashion Industries	140.53	+4.48	140.45	+.56	141.01	+.48
George Washington	125.04	+3.03	124.97	+.50	125.47	+.43
H.S. Music & Art	122.71	+ .54	122.64	+.37	123.01	+.30
Julia Richman	123.75	+2.01	123.68	+.37	124.05	+.30
Louis D. Brandeis	163.66	+ .64	163.56	+.49	164.05	+.39
* Mabel D. Bacon	72.45	+1.71	72.41	+.22	72.63	+.18
* Manhattan	99.84	-4.24	99.78	-.40	99.38	-.46
Martin L. King Jr.	121.12	-2.59	121.05	-.36	120.69	-.43
Murry Bergtraum	90.07	+4.22	90.02	+.36	90.38	+.31
* N.Y. Printing	95.88	-2.00	95.82	-.29	95.53	-.35
Norman Thomas	146.72	+1.57	146.63	+.44	147.07	+.35
Park West	86.08	+1.58	86.03	+.26	86.29	+.21
Seward Park	133.49	+5.54	133.41	+.67	134.08	+.59
Stuyvesant	131.81	+ .23	131.73	+.40	132.13	+.32
Washington Irving	108.02	-1.96	107.96	-.32	107.64	-.38
Food and Maritime 1	90.18	- .16	90.13	-.27	89.86	-.32
Sub-total	(2,205.19)		(2,203.89)	(+2.63)	(2,206.52)	(+1.33)

Footnotes are on the following page

High School	Net Staff Units - (PSEN + Discretes)	% Change in Attendance	Adj. Net (A)	Unit Change	New Net - (PSEN + Discretes)	Gain or Loss
Adlai Stevenson	187.85	-1.45	187.74	-.56	187.18	-.67
* Alfred E. Smith	104.46	- .80	104.40	-.31	104.09	-.37
Bronx H.S. Science	164.94	- .14	164.84	-.50	164.34	-.60
C. Columbus	138.50	+1.67	138.42	-.42	138.00	-.50
DeWitt Clinton	169.44	+3.12	169.34	+.68	170.02	+.58
Evander Childs	138.47	± .06	138.39	+.42	138.81	+.34
* Grace Dodge	103.02	+ .93	102.96	+.31	103.27	+.25
Harry S. Truman	148.28	+1.99	148.19	+.45	148.64	+.36
Herbert Lehman	167.68	-3.56	167.58	-.67	166.91	-.77
James Monroe	114.16	+3.22	114.09	+.46	114.55	+.39
* Jane Addams	77.88	-5.32	77.83	-.39	77.44	-.44
John F. Kennedy	198.33	-1.31	198.21	-.60	197.61	-.72
Morris	108.55	+ .48	108.48	+.33	108.81	+.26
* Samuel Gompers	80.12	-3.88	80.07	-.32	79.75	-.37
South Bronx[2]						
Theo. Roosevelt	171.91	-1.81	171.81	-.52	171.29	-.62
Walton	102.58	+1.15	102.52	+.31	102.83	+.25
William H. Taft	176.37	-1.29	176.26	-.53	175.73	-.64
Sub-total	(2,352.54)		(2,351.13)	(-1.86)	(2,349.27)	(-3.27)
Curtis	105.58	-1.20	105.52	-.32	105.20	-.38
New Dorp	119.82	+1.51	119.75	+.36	120.11	+.29
Port Richmond	122.06	+ .28	121.99	+.37	122.36	+.30
* Ralph McKee	71.66	+4.68	71.62	+.29	71.91	+.25
Susan E. Wagner	134.22	- .79	134.14	-.40	133.74	-.48
Tottenville	225.21	+ .06	225.07	+.68	225.75	+.54
Sub-total	(778.55)		(778.09)	(+.98)	(779.07)	(+.52)
TOTAL	13,165.70		13,157.90	(+8.06)	(13,165.96)	(+.26)

(A) Adjusted Net reflects an additional budget adjustment of .06% to redistribute the units needed to implement the proposal.

[1] Food and Maritime is included for this year.

[2] South Bronx was not open during this time.

TABLE 5

1978 FALL TERM EVALUATION OF HSPA ATTENDANCE PROPOSAL

BASED ON ATTENDANCE FIGURES FOR 1976-77 AND 1977-78

*Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools High School	Net Staff Units - (PSEN & Discretes)	% Change in Attendance	Adj. Net (A)	Unit Change	New Net - (PSEN & Discretes	Gain or Loss
Abraham Lincoln	124.27	- .25	123.91	- .37	123.54	- .73
* Alex Hamilton	83.50	+ 5.43	83.10	+ .42	83.52	+ .02
* Automotive	93.82	+ 1.25	93.59	+ .28	93.87	+ .05
Bay Ridge	99.89	+ 4.27	99.65	+ .40	100.05	+ .16
Boys and Girls	198.25	+ 2.76	197.77	+ .59	198.36	+ .11
Brooklyn Tech.	292.78	+ 4.21	292.08	+ 1.17	293.25	+ .47
Bushwick	105.66	+ 1.18	105.41	+ .32	105.73	+ .07
Canarsie	116.04	+ .33	115.76	+ .35	116.11	+ .07
Clara Barton	122.81	+ 5.46	122.52	+ .61	123.13	+ .32
Eastern District	103.47	+ 2.01	103.22	+ .31	103.53	+ .06
* East New York	93.87	+ 6.23	93.64	+ .47	94.11	+ .24
Edward R. Murrow	130.97	+ .41	130.66	+ .39	131.05	+ .08
* Eli Whitney	118.33	+ 5.83	118.05	+ .59	118.64	+ .31
Erasmus Hall	177.63	+ 2.39	177.20	+ .53	177.73	+ .10
Fort Hamilton	153.42	+ 1.05	153.05	+ .46	153.51	+ .09
F.D. Roosevelt	162.95	+ 8.14	162.56	+ .81	163.37	+ .42
Franklin K. Lane	220.44	+ 1.85	219.91	+ .66	220.57	+ .13
* Geo. Westinghouse	128.04	+ 4.48	127.73	+ .51	128.24	+ .20
Geo. W. Wingate	139.55	+ 3.09	139.22	+ .56	139.78	+ .23
James Madison	137.13	- 1.09	136.80	- .41	136.39	- .74
John Dewey	173.66	+ 1.27	173.24	+ .52	173.76	+ .10
John Jay	170.84	+ 3.71	170.43	+ .68	171.11	+ .27
Lafayette	145.42	+ 3.39	145.07	+ .58	145.65	+ .23
Midwood	132.71	+ 1.72	132.39	+ .40	132.79	+ .08
New Utrecht	121.44	+ 3.14	121.15	+ .49	121.64	+ .20
Prospect Heights	119.49	+ .78	119.20	+ .36	119.56	+ .07
Samuel J. Tilden	123.45	- 1.97	123.15	- .37	122.78	- .67
Sarah J. Hale	118.48	+ 2.38	118.20	+ .36	118.56	+ .08
Sheepshead Bay	130.93	+ .50	130.62	+ .39	131.01	+ .08
South Shore	202.38	+ 3.47	201.89	+ .81	202.70	+ .32
Thomas Jefferson	139.52	+ 3.36	139.19	+ .56	139.75	+ .23
* Wm. E. Grady	120.34	+ 2.78	120.05	+ .36	120.41	+ .07
* Wm. H. Maxwell	94.31	+ .40	94.08	+ .28	94.36	+ .05
Sub-total	(4,595.79)		(4,584.49)	(14.07)	(4,598.56)	(+ 2.77)

(A) Adjusted Net reflects an additional budget adjustment of .24% to redistribute the units needed to implement the proposal.

High School	Net Staff Units - (PSEN & Discretes)	% Change in Attendance	Adj. Net (A)	Unit Change	New Net - (PSEN & Discretes)	Gain or Loss
Andrew Jackson	117.16	- .43	116.88	- .35	116.53	- .63
August Martin	106.20	+ 1.79	105.95	+ .32	106.27	+ .07
* Aviation	147.01	+ .75	146.66	+ .44	147.10	+ .09
Bayside	166.94	+ 1.09	166.54	+ .50	167.04	+ .10
Beach Channel	167.46	+ 2.82	167.06	+ .50	167.56	+ .10
Benj. N. Cardozo	139.00	+ 3.17	138.67	+ .56	139.23	+ .23
Far Rockaway	101.03	- .09	100.79	- .30	100.49	- .54
Flushing	119.48	+ 2.38	119.19	+ .36	119.55	+ .07
Forest Hills	104.29	+ 1.48	104.04	+ .31	104.35	+ .06
Francis Lewis	125.14	+ 7.85	124.84	+ .62	125.46	+ .32
Grover Cleveland	170.28	+ 1.95	169.87	+ .51	170.38	+ .10
Hillcrest	149.87	+ .20	149.51	+ .45	149.96	+ .09
Jamaica	146.70	+ .72	146.35	+ .44	146.79	+ .09
John Adams	196.54	- 1.55	196.07	- .59	195.48	- 1.06
John Bowne	167.91	+ 3.12	167.51	+ .67	168.18	+ .27
Long Island City	138.48	+ 2.86	138.15	+ .41	138.56	+ .08
Martin Van Buren	153.09	+ 4.26	152.72	+ .61	153.33	+ .24
Newtown	188.74	+ 3.64	188.29	+ .75	189.04	+ .30
* Queens	75.73	+ .78	75.55	+ .23	75.88	+ .15
Richmond Hill	126.96	+ 4.85	126.66	+ .51	127.17	+ .21
Springfield Gdns.	141.73	- .43	141.39	- .42	140.97	- .76
* Thomas A. Edison	131.36	+ 3.46	131.04	+ .52	131.56	+ .20
William C. Bryant	158.11	- 3.78	157.73	- .63	157.10	-1.01
Sub-total	(3,239.21)		(3,231.46)	(6.42)	(3,237.98)	(-1.23)
* Art and Design	128.94	+ .38	128.63	+ .39	129.02	+ .08
Benjamin Franklin	64.75	+ 2.89	64.59	+ .19	64.78	+ .03
Chas E. Hughes	100.96	+ 3.15	100.72	+ .40	101.12	+ .16
* Chelsea	63.72	- 2.20	63.57	- .19	63.38	- .34
* Fashion Industries	143.84	+ 2.52	143.49	+ .43	143.92	+ .08
George Washington	114.25	+ 6.44	113.98	+ .57	114.55	+ .30
H.S. Music & Art	130.05	- .77	129.74	- .39	129.35	- .70
Julia Richman	129.31	+ 1.01	129.00	+ .39	129.39	+ .08
Louis D. Brandeis	166.58	- 3.10	166.18	- .66	165.52	- 1.06
* Mabel D. Bacon	71.22	+ 2.10	71.05	+ .21	71.26	+ .04
* Manhattan	81.88	+ .92	81.68	+ .25	81.93	+ .05
Martin L. King Jr.	112.64	+ 3.81	112.37	+ .45	112.82	+ .18
Murry Bergtraum	128.73	+ 1.32	128.42	+ .39	128.81	+ .08
* N.Y. Printing	94.28	+ 3.00	94.05	+ .38	94.53	+ .25
Norman Thomas	146.71	+ 2.68	146.44	+ .44	146.88	+ .09
Park West[1]						
Seward Park	137.83	- 1.52	137.50	- .41	137.09	- .74
Stuyvesant	142.66	+ 4.60	142.32	+ .57	142.89	+ .23
Washington Irving	109.93	+ 2.62	109.67	+ .33	110.00	+ .07
Sub-total	(2,068.30)		(2,063.40)	(3.74)	(2,067.24)	(-1.12)

[1] Park West is not included in this chart because it was just opened 9/78.

High School	Net Staff Units - (PSEN & Discretes)	% Change in Attendance	Adj. Net (A)	Unit Change	New Net - (PSEN & Discretes)	Gain or Loss
Adlai Stevenson	173.69	+ 1.84	173.27	+ .52	173.79	+ .10
* Alfred E. Smith	99.05	+ 5.27	98.81	+ .49	99.30	+ .25
Bronx H.S. Science	169.63	+ 1.57	169.22	+ .51	169.73	+ .10
C. Columbus	129.32	+ 6.29	129.01	+ .65	129.66	+ .34
DeWitt Clinton	171.96	+ 1.06	171.55	+ .52	172.07	+ .11
Evander Childs	133.36	- .12	133.04	- .40	132.64	- .72
* Grace Dodge	103.28	+ 1.59	103.03	+ .31	103.34	+ .06
Harry S. Truman	151.48	- 2.11	151.12	- .45	150.67	- .81
Herbert Lehman	134.72	+ 1.18	134.40	+ .40	134.80	+ .08
James Monroe	110.80	+ .83	110.53	+ .33	110.86	+ .06
* Jane Addams	82.80	+ 1.01	82.60	+ .25	82.85	+ .05
John F. Kennedy	199.75	+ 4.71	199.27	+ .80	200.07	+ .32
Morris	104.36	+ 1.95	104.11	+ .31	104.42	+ .06
* Samuel Gompers	58.08	- 3.68	57.94	- .23	57.71	- .37
South Bronx[2]						
Theo. Roosevelt	164.24	+ 8.90	163.85	+ .82	164.67	+ .43
Walton	139.12	+ 1.67	138.79	+ .42	139.21	+ .09
William H. Taft	154.57	- .40	154.20	- .46	153.74	- .83
Sub-total	(2,280.21)		(2,274.74)	(4.79)	(2,279.53)	(- .68)
Curtis	106.41	+ 2.19	106.15	+ .32	106.47	+ .06
New Dorp	125.49	+ 1.50	125.19	+ .38	125.57	+ .08
Port Richmond	133.70	+ .04	133.38	+ .40	133.78	+ .08
* Ralph McKee	77.30	+ 2.78	77.11	+ .23	77.34	+ .04
Susan E. Wagner	132.44	+ 3.69	132.12	+ .53	132.65	+ .21
Tottenville	228.48	+ 2.17	227.93	+ .68	228.61	+ .13
Sub-total	(803.32)		(801.88)	(2.54)	(304.12)	(.60)
GRAND TOTAL	12,987.39		12,955.97	31.56	12,987.73	+ .34

[2] South Bronx is not included in this chart because it was not open in 1976-77.

loses two times: once for the cut, and then again as a penalty. This double penalty could be particularly hard on a school in a transitional neighborhood, whose declining attendance is not primarily school-related.

III. REMOVING THE CURRENT DIS-INCENTIVES FOR INCREASING ATTENDANCE

In light of the City's fiscal problems, it has been difficult to adequately address the issue of attendance from a school's limited funds. We applaud the Chancellor's concept of providing resources specifically for attendance improvement, but would caution against the use of funds from the unit allocation formula for these programs, particularly with the likelihood that no new units will be available for distribution in the next school year. It would be unfair to decrease the flexibility a principal has to balance the instructional and administrative needs in his or her school by mandating the use of certain units for attendance programs, as the principals are already under severe constraints due to the budget cut. Certainly, however, if a student is counted in the register to determine the level of funding a school will receive, the principal should be held accountable for expending funds to meet the needs of this student, regardless of his or her attendance.

Attendance programs should be a part of each school's support system. But any program, with no additional funds for attendance, would mean that to provide fiscal incentives within the allocation formula to schools with low or decreasing attendance. It would be difficult to factor in any special considerations, such as the state of the sur-

rounding community, that might be causing a decrease in attendance, and so those schools in transitional areas which might need additional support to prevent a decline in attendance, would actually lose funds.

Schools with low attendance are concerned with the needs of long-term truants and a very mobile population. This may result in relatively small daily classes, accompanied by the difficulties of addressing a different group of students with differing backgrounds each day. Those schools with high attendance are concerned with crowded classrooms and the problem of meeting union restrictions on maximum class size. Both situations create difficulties, and merit serious consideration. However, it is our contention that services should not be provided to one group of students by denying services to another. The schools cannot "rob Peter to pay Paul." That is certainly not to say that some means of encouragement should not be given to those schools with high attendance. It is only to emphasize the fact that the assistance should not be at the expense of those schools with poor attendance.

A final consideration must be the basis of state funding. It would be difficult for New York City to continue to make the case, as it has for years, that state funds should be allocated according to register (not attendance) if the City distributed funds according to attendance (not register). There should be a consistent line of argument and practice.

The following recommendations are made in order to remove the current disincentives for increasing attendance:

1. The allocation formula, whatever its form, should be considered to be child-specific funds. While different services may be provided to different students, a student must receive services in return for the funding that he/she attracts to the schools. If a full instructional load is inappropriate for a student, alter-

native supportive services should be offered. Under no circumstances should one student's program depend on the absence of another. The evaluation and monitoring of such a targeting of funds would be a part of the task performed by the borough superintendents in supervising all principals.

2. A certain number of Executive Director's discretionary units should be reserved for attendance purposes. A number of these would be assigned, on a per capita basis, to the schools for their LTA's. The amount would be less than that for students on the allocation register, so that there would be an incentive to succeed in bringing long-term truants back to the schools, at which time the schools would be awarded a higher allocation.

In fall, 1978, there were 12,475 LTA's. If each of these students were allocated funds at the same average per capita rate as other students on the estimated register (0.046929 or one unit for every 21.31 students), 585.4 units would be necessary. If, however, the allocation is at a lesser rate, as suggested, .499 units would be necessary to allocate units for LTA's at a per capita rate of 0.40000, or one unit for every twenty-five students. In the fall of 1978, the Executive Director distributed 648.08 units from discretionary funds, and the borough superintendents distributed 161.05 units.[4] Thus, there are ample units available to provide services to the LTA's if this is made a division priority and discretionary funds are targeted appropriately. Also, these funds would be contingent on the approval of a plan, produced by the principal, detailing the objectives and strategies of an attendance program. In the same vein, schools with documented hardships or a proposal for enriching the program of a school with high attendance school be awarded additional discrete units.

NOTES

1. Macchiarola, Frank J., Chancellor of Schools, September 2, 1978, Memoranda to the New York City Board of Education.

2. Figures from Division of High Schools, New York City Board of Education.

3. "Inequitable Allotments and Problems which Develop from Inequitable Allotments," 1975 Proposal of Committee of Concerned Parents of Specialized High Schools.

4. Figures from the Division of High Schools, New York City Board of Education and individual borough superintendents.

CHAPTER VI

FLEXIBILITY IN THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS

As discussed in Chapter II, one of the primary purposes of the unit allocation formula is to increase the flexibility available to a principal in appropriating a school's funding. The substitution of units for positions does provide a principal with various personnel options which did not previously exist. These options, as explained in Chapter II, result in a more efficient and cost-effective school. However, as a result of both the amount of funding which remains separate from the unit allocation, and the structure of the formula itself, flexibility is limited.

I. THE CASE FOR INCREASED FLEXIBILITY

It is the contention of the report that the principal should be given more flexibility in running the school. This is based on the premise that the principal sets the tone of the school, and he or she should have the ability to use resources as he or she sees fit. In 1971, a study was done of inner city schools who had successful reading achievement for poor children. "All four schools have 'strong leadership' in that their principal is instrumental in: setting the tone of the school; helping decide on instructional strategies; and organizing and distributing the school's resources."[1]

A subsequent study in 1974 by the New York State Office of Education Performance Review reconfirmed these indications, finding that "administrative behavior, policies and practices with schools appeared to have a significant impact on school effectiveness;" and "the more effective inner city school was led by an administrative team which provided a good balance between both management and instructional skills."[2]

There was unanimous consent among those principals interviewed during this study, that the unit allocation formula had provided greater flexibility for staffing decisions. However, major disincentives remain for the principal who wishes to take a leadership role.

Chapter I describes the several layers of funding which enter an individual high school. The unit allocation, OTPS money, school aide hours, and school guards are all allotted by different methods, accompanied by varying restrictions. The resulting web limits the principal's options in three ways.

I. CATEGORICAL FUNDING

The first problem results from the categorical nature of the funding. Earmarking funds is a sound accountability practice in appropriate situations. Restricting the use of funds, or awarding categorical funds, ensures that they are used for specific purposes, and not diverted to other, possibly less desirable, ends. However, categorical funds may be counterproductive if the money can only be used for services that are not required. Sometimes, a need may exist and the available funds may be used for anything but meeting that need.

The unit allocation formula was introduced to resolve this type of problem. The previous allocation by position, a categorical type of funding, was replaced with the more flexible unit format. However, OTPS and school aides remained separate. Although units may be converted into additional school aide hours, a principal may not convert school aide hours into units. Thus, for example, the principal may not reduce school aides in order to hire an additional teacher if this seems advisable. Likewise, if a principal could improve school services by expanding the responsibilities of the aides and hiring paraprofessionals

with additional training, this would not be allowed.

II. DISINCENTIVES TO COST-EFFECTIVENESS

A second problem which arises is the disincentive for management savings. If savings in one category could be converted for use in other areas, there would be an effective stimulus to cost-effective organization of a school. However, if savings cannot be applied to other purposes, but must be returned, there is no reason to save money.

For example, school guards are allocated, in part, according to the number of serious incidents. A school that has a limited number of incidents receives fewer guards. However, a school may have prevented serious incidents by an effective use of aides, teachers on administrative periods, and other staff. Rather than being able to hire other staff with the savings which accrue by using fewer guards, the school is penalized and allotted a smaller security force. There is a disincentive for this type of effective management, and good reason to rely on school guards and simply demand more of them.

These first two problems would be solved by incorporating all funding within the unit allocation formula. This one block grant would include all Personal Services (PS) and Other Than Personal Services (OTPS), As mentioned in Chapter III, further study is necessary before making a final evaluation of the Office of School safety and the precise allocation of guards for individual schools and mobile task forces. Finally, we must emphasize that broadening the formula should not be used to mask a decrease in available funds. Funding for the high schools must be maintained. A principal cannot be asked to fund additional positions from

the unit allocation without also incorporating the funds which are attached to these positions.

III. COMPONENTS OF THE FORMULA

A third problem, concerning the derivation of the formula is more difficult to solve. Certain assumptions that are inherent in the structure of the formula tend to perpetuate a single pattern of staffing. This is a result of the distinction between basic support and instruction in the unit allocation formula.

After extensive discussion with staff at the Divison of High School, it appears that the allocation for basic support units was derived from the staffing patterns that had been used as the basis for the earlier allocation which was based on positions. In effect, each school is given the number of units which approximates the number of positions that would have been awarded under the earlier system.

However, in order to meet the constraints imposed by the below-the-line cut imposed by the fiscal crisis, few schools use this number of units for basic support. The Mayor's Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) proposal[3] to cut the high school budget by $4 million is premised on the fact that most schools are not using the full twenty units alloted for basic support. In fact eighty-one of the schools convert these units into instructional units. (See Table 1). Most of this cut, then, affects direct pupil services, and its ramifications should be carefully examined. It is misleading to allocate a specific number of units for a specified purpose if principals are to have the flexibility to allocate units as they deem appropriate. Is OMB correct for holding principals accountable for implementing the formula, or are principals, indeed, responsible for managing their schools in the most effective manner, whatever the resultant staffing?

TABLE 1

FALL 1977 - USE OF BASIC UNITS

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Net Units	A Net Basic Units[1] Allocated	Units Used For Teachers & Supervision	B Units Used For Basic Staff	A-B
Abraham Lincoln	131.89	29.83	107.44	24.45	+5.38
* Alex Hamilton	88.15	20.13	69.00	19.15	+.98
* Automotive	105.10	21.51	86.00	19.10	+2.41
Bay Ridge	114.01	24.93	87.12	26.89	-1.96
Boys and Girls	208.22	41.74	177.20	31.02	+10.72
Brooklyn Tech.	304.51	47.58	267.16	37.35	+10.23
Bushwick	145.78	31.22	118.80	26.98	+4.24
Canarsie	133.05	29.08	109.96	23.09	+5.99
Clara Barton	130.77	26.26	109.20	21.57	+4.69
Eastern District	120.43	28.32	98.40	22.03	+6.29
* East New York	104.37	22.06	82.80	21.57	+.49
Edward R. Murrow	124.90	26.90	112.36	12.54	+14.36
* Eli Whitney	140.91	26.97	116.80	24.11	+2.86
Erasmus Hall	193.76	38.38	160.20	33.56	+4.82
Fort Hamilton	174.42	36.64	143.96	30.46	+6.18
F.D. Roosevelt	194.26	38.92	162.00	32.26	+6.66
Franklin K. Lane	202.69	37.57	165.00	37.69	-.12
* Geo. Westinghouse	127.43	24.23	106.80	20.63	+3.60
Geo. W. Wingate	143.92	30.12	115.60	28.32	+1.80
James Madison	131.46	29.86	107.64	23.82	+6.04
John Dewey	205.82	33.91	149.00	56.82	-22.91
John Jay	189.52	38.28	153.56	35.96	+2.32
Lafayette	162.91	34.56	135.40	27.51	+7.05
Midwood	131.42	28.91	108.00	23.42	+5.49
New Utrecht	133.70	29.86	112.52	21.18	+8.68
Prospect Heights	134.09	29.76	113.12	20.97	+8.79
Samuel J. Tilden	130.70	28.87	102.80	27.90	+.97
Sarah J. Hale	140.52	27.25	109.00	31.52	-4.27
Sheepshead Bay	147.14	32.53	122.80	24.34	+8.19
South Shore	222.06	42.32	189.60	32.46	+9.86
Thomas Jefferson	182.38	37.04	138.00	44.38	-7.34
* Wm. E. Grady	123.90	25.20	104.00	19.90	+5.30
* Wm. H. Maxwell	102.75	22.27	82.00	20.75	+1.52
	5026.94	(1023.01)	(4123.24)	(903.70)	(+119.31)

[1] Reflects a 13.5% budget adjustment.

High School	Net Units	A Net Basic Units[1] Allocated	Units Used For Teachers & Supervision	B Units Used For Basic Staff	A-B
Andrew Jackson	129.36	27.21	103.00	26.36	+.85
August Martin	108.60	22.68	77.20	31.60	-8.92
* Aviation	168.69	29.17	143.40	25.29	+3.88
Bayside	179.18	36.98	151.92	27.26	+9.72
Beach Channel	178.48	34.44	141.80	36.68	-2.24
Benj. N. Cardozo	163.34	33.39	137.96	25.38	+8.01
Far Rockaway	108.44	25.43	87.76	20.68	+4.75
Flushing	133.21	29.48	107.64	25.57	+3.91
Forest Hills	128.83	28.79	105.80	23.03	+5.76
Francis Lewis	136.71	30.61	113.88	22.83	+7.78
Grover Cleveland	209.78	42.19	175.76	34.02	+8.17
Hillcrest	151.00	30.29	113.48	37.52	-7.23
Jamaica	169.53	32.71	143.84	25.69	+7.02
John Adams	218.99	43.03	188.32	30.67	+12.36
John Bowne	181.35	37.32	156.52	24.83	+12.49
Long Island City	136.75	30.83	112.40	24.35	+6.48
Martin Van Buren	173.12	36.32	146.64	26.48	+9.84
Newtown	223.98	43.56	193.08	30.90	+12.66
* Queens	81.16	19.39	65.00	16.16	+3.23
Richmond Hill	136.00	29.63	114.80	21.20	+8.43
Springfield Gdns.	154.60	32.78	133.48	21.12	+11.66
* Thomas A. Edison	131.48	26.10	115.40	16.08	+10.02
William C. Bryant	171.22	35.84	144.72	26.50	+9.34
	(3,573.80)	(738.17)	(2,973.80)	(600.20)	(+137.97)
* Art and Design	129.61	26.38	105.48	24.13	+2.25
Benjamin Franklin	94.03	24.96	72.80	21.23	+3.73
Chas E. Hughes	99.68	23.68	73.30	26.38	-2.70
* Chelsea	67.61	17.62	50.40	17.21	+.41
* Fashion Industries	146.93	28.46	116.40	30.53	-2.07
George Washington	150.08	31.62	119.80	30.28	+1.34
H.S. Music & Art	132.56	27.00	108.40	24.16	+2.84
Julia Richman	147.30	31.64	118.50	28.80	+2.84
Louis D. Brandeis	200.47	38.38	161.80	38.67	-.29
* Mabel D. Bacon	81.07	19.45	66.62	14.45	+5.00
* Manhattan	109.13	23.01	82.00	27.13	-4.12
Martin L. King Jr.	131.12	27.51	108.40	22.72	-4.79
Murry Bergtraum	96.07	22.29	71.80	24.27	-1.98
* N.Y. Printing	105.72	22.23	82.80	22.92	-.69
Norman Thomas	155.52	30.78	132.00	23.52	+7.26
Haaran Haaran	103.30	23.34	76.52	26.78	-3.44
Seward Park	156.71	33.47	127.52	29.19	+4.28
Stuyvesant	140.79	28.80	118.38	22.41	+6.39
Washington Irving	122.58	26.59	101.30	21.28	+5.31
Food & Maritime	102.75	21.69	82.00	20.75	+.94
	(2,473.03)	(528.9)	(1,975.50)	(496.81)	(+32.09)

High School	Net Units	A Net Basic Units[1] Allocated	Units Used For Teachers & Supervision	B Units Used For Basic Staff	A-B
Adlai Stevenson	203.03	39.63	169.00	34.03	+5.60
* Alfred E. Smith	116.03	23.43	96.80	19.23	+4.20
Bronx H.S. Science	172.64	33.60	144.50	28.14	+5.46
C. Columbus	150.60	31.59	125.84	24.76	+6.83
DeWitt Clinton	186.54	38.04	153.04	33.50	+4.54
Evander Childs	149.63	32.03	116.00	33.63	-1.60
* Grace Dodge	112.84	24.06	95.50	17.34	+6.72
Harry S. Truman	154.83	32.01	120.96	33.87	-1.86
Herbert Lehman	182.63	36.20	150.80	31.83	+4.37
James Monroe	133.36	28.00	108.92	24.44	+3.56
* Jane Addams	88.47	20.07	72.50	15.97	+4.10
John F. Kennedy	214.52	40.33	181.40	33.12	+7.21
Morris	126.24	27.56	98.00	28.24	-.68
* Samuel Gompers	88.02	20.15	68.00	20.02	+.13
South Bronx	30.78	17.30	17.60	13.18	+4.12
Theo. Roosevelt	200.46	38.35	161.28	39.18	-.83
Walton	117.91	26.12	93.36	24.55	+1.57
William H. Taft	200.77	40.33	166.00	34.77	+5.56
	(2,629.30)	(548.80)	(2,139.50)	(489.80)	(+59.00)
Curtis	124.00	26.44	100.16	23.84	+2.60
New Dorp	126.82	28.69	104.08	22.74	+5.95
Port Richmond	137.21	29.75	114.28	22.93	+6.82
* Ralph McKee	80.13	19.10	63.56	16.57	+2.53
Susan E. Wagner	145.37	31.37	119.40	25.97	+5.40
Tottenville	238.13	43.60	202.68	35.45	+8.15
	(851.66)	(178.95)	(704.16)	(147.50)	(+31.45)
TOTAL	14,554.73	3,017.81	11,916.92	2,638.01	+379.82

A problem is posed by the dependance on the curriculum index to determine instructional units. For example, a principal may find that, fortunately, after organizing the school's personnel, there is one unit still available. If this unit is used to hire an additional teacher who will teach five classes of maximum size daily, the school's curriculum index would be increased enough to yield an additional 1.13 units the next year.[4] However, the principal may feel that the student body would receive more benefit if class size were reduced. Using the additional unit for a teacher who would teach five classes of twenty-five students each, allowing all other classes in that department to be reduced in size comparably, would have no fiscal reward. Additional guidance, security, educational assistants in the classroom, or additional classroom supplies would also be "expensive" uses for the unit, yielding no future financial return. Obviously, the formula supplies motivation for making certain educational decisions. Due to budget limitations, the high schools cannot offer both small classes and a wide range of course offerings in a long school day. However, the choice should be based on the appropriate educational program for a specific child. Without stating a preference, we would recommend that a principal and school staff be encouraged to make this decision based on the merits of the argument for improved education, not influenced by the assumptions within the allocation formula. The proposal in Chapter VIII addresses this problem.

NOTES

1. Edmonds, Ron, "A Discussion of the Literature and Issues Related to Effective Schooling." Harvard University, p. 20.

2. Op. cit., p. 22.

3. New York City Office of Management and Budget, Optional Reductions To Close the Budget Gap, released January 4, 1979.

4. Units for Instruction and Supervision = $\frac{1.05 \times \text{Register} \times \text{Curriculum Index}}{5 \times 31.5}$

Register = R
Curriculum Index = C
Register x # of Instructional Periods = # of Pupil Periods

1 unit used for 1 teacher, teaching the maximum number of pupils per day = 5 periods x 34 students = 170 pupil periods

$$C_{new} = \frac{(R \times C_{original}) + 170}{R}$$

$$C_{new} = C_{original} + \frac{170}{R}$$

$$C_{new} - C_{original} = \frac{170}{R}$$

$$\frac{1.05 \times R \times C_{original}}{5 \times 31.5} = \text{original units}$$

$$\frac{1.05 \times R \times C_{new}}{5 \times 31.5} = \text{new units}$$

The increase = new units - original units

$$= \frac{1.05 \times R \times (C_{new} - C_{original})}{5 \times 31.5}$$

$$= \frac{1.05 \times R \times 170/R}{5 \times 31.5}$$

$$= 1.13$$

CHAPTER VII

EQUITY IN THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

The final question to be addressed by this study concerns the equitable distribution of units. One of the basic advantages of any allocation formula is its objectivity. A formula is supposedly blind to any special interests, distributing funds without acknowledging any outside pressures. Every student should be able to expect that the New York City Board of Education has given each child's education an equal priority. If instruction is to be individualized to meet the needs of each child, programs will be as varied as the student population. However, no child should be penalized because he or she is unfortunate enough to attend a neighborhood school that receives less funding than another.

I. THE EFFECT OF THE CURRICULUM INDEX

Just as the weight of the curriculum index may affect a principal's flexibility, it affects the per capita allocation.

Table 1 lists the curriculum index for the last three years for each school. It is apparent that progress has been made: 29 schools had a decrease, but 67 schools showed an increase in the curriculum index for tax-levy classes (one school was stable). However, major discrepencies remain for fall, 1978. The curriculum index ranges from 5.20 to 7.0.

If a school wishes to increase its curriculum index, this must be done out of existing funds. The allocation for the next term will then increase, reflecting a higher index. While a school may request funding

TABLE 1

CURRICULUM INDEX - 1975 - 1978

TAX LEVY ONLY

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Change 1975 to 1978
Abraham Lincoln	5.70	5.85	5.89	6.04	+.34
* Alex Hamilton	6.95	6.84	6.96	7.00	+.05
* Automotive	7.00	6.95	6.66	6.89	-.11
Bay Ridge	6.29	6.33	5.86	6.23	-.06
Boys and Girls	5.37	6.55	6.01	6.07	+.70
Brooklyn Tech.	6.89	6.83	6.99	7.00	+.11
Bushwick	5.35	5.04	4.91	5.31	-.04
Canarsie	6.18	6.12	6.17	6.25	+.07
Clara Barton	6.85	6.67	6.68	6.85	0
Eastern District	4.11	4.80	5.04	5.20	+1.09
* East New York	6.68	6.73	6.85	7.00	+.32
Edward R. Murrow	7.68[2]	6.54	6.88	7.00	-.68
* Eli Whitney	6.94	6.85	7.25	6.89	-.05
Erasmus Hall	6.02	5.46	5.35	5.88	-.14
Fort Hamilton	5.55	5.84	5.75	5.97	+.42
F.D. Roosevelt	5.75	6.03	6.14	6.00	+.25
Franklin K. Lane	6.26	6.13	6.78	6.75	+.49
* Geo. Westinghouse	7.45	6.93	6.68	7.00	-.45
Geo. W. Wingate	5.89	5.97	5.91	5.98	+.09
James Madison	5.83	5.40	5.47	5.71	-.12
John Dewey	6.68	7.03	7.18	7.00	+.32
John Jay	5.11	5.48	5.68	5.70	+.59
Lafayette	6.24	5.63	6.41	6.37	+.13
Midwood	5.11	6.00	6.37	6.42	+1.31
New Utrecht	5.73	5.62	5.94	5.98	+.25
Prospect Heights	5.52	5.64	5.80	5.68	+.16
Samuel J. Tilden	5.94	5.73	6.08	6.14	+.20
Sarah J. Hale	6.29	6.40	6.76	6.75	+.46
Sheepshead Bay	5.97	5.54	5.78	5.84	-.13
South Shore	6.35	6.36	6.81	6.57	+.22
Thomas Jefferson	4.42	4.76	5.51	5.30	+.88
* Wm. E. Grady	6.96	6.79	7.15	7.00	+.04
* Wm. H. Maxwell	6.95	7.03	6.22	6.80	-.15

[1] An index of 7.00 may reflect the ceiling imposed for computing the allocation formula.

[2] 1975-76 Figure is not adjusted for mainstreamed special education students.

High School	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Change 1975 to 1978
Andrew Jackson	6.23	6.11	5.78	6.20	-.03
August Martin	7.09	6.76	6.77	6.91	-.18
* Aviation	7.53	7.35	7.47	7.00	-.53
Bayside	5.92	6.03	6.19	6.30	+.38
Beach Channel	7.06	6.67	6.70	6.85	-.21
Benj. N. Cardozo	6.53	6.30	6.28	6.40	-.13
Far Rockaway	6.18	5.79	6.30	6.23	+.05
Flushing	5.99	5.74	5.93	6.03	+.04
Forest Hills	5.95	5.82	6.18	6.25	+.30
Francis Lewis	5.77	5.57	5.44	5.86	+.09
Grover Cleveland	5.95	5.40	6.04	6.10	+.15
Hillcrest	6.00	6.18	6.19	6.62	+.62
Jamaica	6.22	5.36	6.34	6.52	+.30
John Adams	6.05	6.16	5.89	6.03	-.02
John Bowne	6.28	5.15	5.82	6.04	-.24
Long Island City	5.68	5.48	5.56	5.74	+.06
Martin Van Buren	6.13	5.94	6.21	6.29	+.16
Newtown	5.82	5.74	5.79	5.92	+.10
* Queens	6.57	6.10	7.23	7.00	+.43
Richmond Hill	6.05	5.97	6.20	6.23	+.18
Springfield Gdns.	5.89	5.90	6.17	6.24	+.35
* Thomas A. Edison	6.95	6.86	7.19	7.00	+.05
William C. Bryant	5.91	5.91	5.99	5.98	+.07
* Art and Design	7.04	6.88	7.03	7.00	-.04
Benjamin Franklin	4.43	5.44	4.97	5.36	+.93
Chas E. Hughes	5.00	4.58	5.73	5.65	+.65
* Chelsea	6.57	6.78	6.69	6.79	+.22
* Fashion Industries	7.28	6.91	7.20	6.89	-.39
George Washington	4.90	5.08	5.46	5.45	+.55
H.S. Music & Art	6.66	6.40	6.76	7.00	+.34
Julia Richman	5.28	5.51	5.22	5.35	+.07
Louis D. Brandeis	4.01	4.59	5.93	5.82	+1.81
* Mabel D. Bacon	6.56	5.87	6.62	6.77	+.21
* Manhattan	6.77	5.97	6.19	6.64	-.13
Martin L. King Jr.	6.60	6.95	6.57	6.69	+.09
Murry Bergtraum	7.07	6.85	6.87	6.83	-.24
* N.Y. Printing	7.30	6.70	6.69	6.94	-.36
Norman Thomas	6.90	6.78	7.07	6.96	+.06
Park West[3]				6.50	
Seward Park	4.19	5.01	5.70	5.65	+1.46
Stuyvesant	6.86	6.74	6.87	7.00	+.14
Washington Irving	5.73	5.50	5.62	5.92	+.19

[3] Park West High School opened 9/78.

High School	Fall 1975	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978	Change 1975 to 1978
* Adlai Stevenson	7.03	5.62	5.65	6.20	-.83
Alfred E. Smith	5.53	7.05	6.43	6.74	+1.21
Bronx H.S. Science	6.72	6.68	6.79	7.00	+.28
C. Columbus	6.05	5.74	6.17	6.23	+.18
DeWitt Clinton	5.68	5.77	5.88	6.00	+.32
Evander Childs	5.94	6.35	5.61	6.12	+.18
* Grace Dodge	6.88	6.77	6.95	6.90	+.02
Harry S. Truman	7.02	6.23	6.28	6.52	-.50
Herbert Lehman	6.42	6.01	6.15	6.18	-.24
James Monroe	5.08	6.00	6.02	6.16	+1.08
* Jane Addams	6.68	6.77	6.97	6.70	+.02
John F. Kennedy	6.47	5.94	6.17	6.28	-.19
Morris	5.29	5.75	6.25	6.08	+.79
* Samuel Gompers	6.25	6.30	6.10	6.49	+.24
South Bronx[4]	-	-	7.07	6.60	-
Theo. Roosevelt	5.78	5.51	5.28	5.80	+.02
Walton	5.19	5.87	6.05	6.03	+.84
William H. Taft	5.13	5.17	4.91	5.36	+.23
Curtis	5.22	5.38	6.34	6.31	+1.09
New Dorp	6.08	5.84	6.12	6.24	+.16
Port Richmond	5.10	5.35	6.21	6.11	+1.01
* Ralph McKee	7.64	6.55	7.02	6.94	-.70
Susan E. Wagner	5.87	6.19	6.24	6.14	+.27
Tottenville	6.85	6.35	6.29	6.16	-.69

[4] South Bronx High School opened 9/77.

for this higher index, only small increments will be funded in advance, for "each principal's original estimate is reviewed, and, if necessary, adjusted according to experience."[1] The emphasis seems to be on consistency rather than improvement, and, often for the schools with low curriculum index, there is an expectation of low student incentive to take additional courses. Thus, no real effort is made to increase the offerings. For those who attempt to increase these course offerings, they must convince the Central office that their students will take full advantage of the additional offerings.

II. PER CAPITA ALLOCATION

The importance of the curriculum index becomes clear when the number of units actually allocated per capita is computed. We are using the per capita distribution of funds as the indicator of an equitable distribution of the monies to each high school student. Table 2 shows the per capita allocation for Fall 1977 based on the adjusted audited register. If one examines the total net unit allocation, the range is:

> lowest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 22.63 students
> highest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 14.45 students
> average per capita allocation = 1 unit per 19.51 students
> (South Bronx High School opened in 1977 with a register of only 283 students, and an inordinately high per capita allocation.)

However, the total net allocation includes PSEN Units. PSEN monies must be used, according to state legislation, to supplement the education of targeted children. Therefore, these funds cannot be included in a base per capita figure. One should also exclude discrete units, also a part of the total allocation figure, which are distributed at the discretion of the Executive Director or Borough Superintendent to address special needs. Thus, recomputing the per capita rates based on the net units minus PSEN units and discrete units, as shown in the third and fourth

TABLE 2

FALL 1977 - ACTUAL PER CAPITA ALLOCATION

BASED ON ADJUSTED AUDITED REGISTERS

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Net Units		Net Units-(Discretes+PSEN)	
	Per Capita Allocation	# Students For 1 Unit	Per Capita Allocation	# Students For 1 Unit
Abraham Lincoln	.046229	21.63	.043530	22.99
* Alex Hamilton	.060751	16.46	.055534	18.01
* Automotive	.063736	15.69	.055355	18.07
Bay Ridge	.050761	19.70	.044225	22.61
Boys and Girls	.045030	22.21	.040121	24.92
Brooklyn Tech.	.051920	19.26	.049209	20.32
Bushwick	.051695	19.34	.044007	22.72
Canarsie	.048647	20.56	.045514	21.97
Clara Barton	.058668	17.05	.053051	18.85
Eastern District	.046373	21.56	.039911	25.06
* East New York	.065724	15.22	.058942	16.97
Edward R. Murrow	.050485	19.81	.048541	20.60
* Eli Whitney	.064225	15.57	.058555	17.08
Erasmus Hall	.044998	22.22	.040232	24.86
Fort Hamilton	.048209	20.74	.045141	25.15
F.D. Roosevelt	.049823	20.07	.046450	21.53
Franklin K. Lane	.051773	19.32	.047737	20.95
* Geo. Westinghouse	.058081	17.22	.050438	19.83
Geo. W. Wingate	.048969	20.42	.042436	24.13
James Madison	.045614	21.92	.041332	24.26
John Dewey	.060966	16.40	.049473	20.21
John Jay	.046622	21.45	.041383	24.16
Lafayette	.049865	20.05	.046835	21.35
Midwood	.048423	20.65	.045298	22.08
New Utrecht	.046602	21.46	.042140	23.73
Prospect Heights	.050353	19.86	.043969	22.74
Samuel J. Tilden	.048497	20.62	.044160	22.64
Sarah J. Hale	.061362	16.30	.053153	18.81
Sheepshead Bay	.047991	20.84	.044622	22.41
South Shore	.048180	20.76	.044925	22.26
Thomas Jefferson	.050118	19.95	.041179	24.28
* Wm. E. Grady	.060380	16.56	.056983	17.55
* Wm. H. Maxwell	.062767	15.93	.056066	17.84

High School	Net Units Per Capita Allocation	Net Units # Students For 1 Unit	Net Units-(Discrete+PSEN) Per Capita Allocation	Net Units-(Discrete+PSEN) # Students For 1 Unit
Andrew Jackson	.051703	19.34	.045627	21.92
August Martin	.063140	15.84	.054465	18.36
* Aviation	.061364	16.30	.054121	18.48
Bayside	.048089	20.79	.045915	21.78
Beach Channel	.051673	19.35	.048749	20.51
Benj. N. Cardozo	.051674	19.35	.049744	20.10
Far Rockaway	.051467	19.43	.047542	21.03
Flushing	.048617	20.57	.044558	22.44
Forest Hills	.052391	19.09	.049264	20.30
Francis Lewis	.047419	21.09	.044950	22.25
Grover Cleveland	.046576	21.47	.043379	23.05
Hillcrest	.050149	19.94	.046652	21.44
Jamaica	.052292	19.12	.045895	21.79
John Adams	.045405	22.02	.042208	23.69
John Bowne	.046994	21.28	.043408	23.04
Long Island City	.045889	21.79	.041846	23.90
Martin Van Buren	.047417	21.09	.045292	22.08
Newtown	.047972	20.85	.043260	23.12
* Queens	.066145	15.12	.060937	16.41
Richmond Hill	.050445	19.82	.045976	21.75
Springfield Gdns.	.048313	20.70	.044547	22.45
* Thomas A. Edison	.057315	17.45	.053679	18.63
William C. Bryant	.044197	22.63	.040627	24.61
* Art and Design	.061281	16.32	.059518	16.80
Benjamin Franklin	.046093	21.70	.041779	23.94
Chas E. Hughes	.046428	21.54	.037904	26.38
* Chelsea	.062602	15.97	.056806	17.22
* Fashion Industries	.061787	16.18	.059096	16.92
George Washington	.051222	19.52	.042676	23.43
H.S. Music & Art	.054800	18.25	.050728	19.71
Julia Richman	.046555	21.48	.039112	25.57
Louis D. Brandeis	.051416	19.45	.041975	23.82
* Mabel D. Bacon	.064036	15.62	.058759	17.02
* Manhattan	.064346	15.54	.058868	16.99
Martin L. King Jr.	.054115	18.48	.049988	20.00
Murry Bergtraum	.056512	17.70	.052982	18.87
* N.Y. Printing	.065705	15.22	.059590	16.78
Norman Thomas	.052683	18.98	.049702	20.12
Park West	.063726	15.69	.053103	18.83
Seward Park	.046557	21.48	.039658	25.22
Stuyvesant	.053068	18.84	.049683	20.13
Washington Irving	.051963	19.24	.045791	21.82
Food and Maritime	.060264	16.59	.052891	18.91

High School	Net Unit Per Capita Allocation	Net Unit # Students For 1 Unit	Net Units-(Discrete+PSEN) Per Capita Allocation	Net Units-(Discrete+PSEN) # Students For 1 Unit
Adlai Stevenson	.046922	21.31	.043413	23.03
* Alfred E. Smith	.062115	16.10	.055921	17.88
Bronx H.S. Science	.051153	19.55	.048871	20.46
C. Columbus	.048785	20.50	.044866	22.29
DeWitt Clinton	.044895	22.27	.040780	24.52
Evander Childs	.048471	20.63	.044856	22.29
* Grace Dodge	.057337	17.44	.052348	19.10
Harry S. Truman	.049121	20.36	.047043	21.26
Herbert Lehman	.050173	19.93	.046066	21.71
James Monroe	.049948	20.02	.042757	23.39
* Jane Addams	.059536	16.80	.052409	19.08
John F. Kennedy	.048424	20.65	.044770	22.34
Morris	.050678	19.73	.043577	22.95
* Samuel Gompers	.069198	14.45	.062987	15.88
South Bronx	.108763	9.19	.096749	10.34
Theo. Roosevelt	.046924	21.31	.040241	24.85
Walton	.048804	20.49	.042459	23.55
William H. Taft	.047430	21.08	.041665	24.00
Curtis	.055806	17.99	.047516	21.05
New Dorp	.048276	20.71	.045611	21.92
Port Richmond	.049250	20.30	.043812	22.82
* Ralph McKee	.062847	15.91	.056204	17.79
Susan E. Wagner	.048280	20.70	.044577	22.43
Tottenville	.049569	20.17	.046880	21.33
AVERAGE	.051247	19.51	.046453	21.53

TABLE 3

FALL 1978 - ACTUAL PER CAPITA ALLOCATION

BASED ON NET UNITS - (DISCRETES + PSEN)

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Adjusted Audited Register		Estimated Register	
	Per Capita Allocation	# Students For 1 Unit	Per Capita Allocation	# Students For Every Unit
Abraham Lincoln	.045721	21.87	.044911	22.27
* Alex Hamilton	.067666	14.78	.055667	17.96
* Automotive	.056315	17.76	.057347	17.44
Bay Ridge	.046569	21.47	.047341	21.12
Boys and Girls	.049316	20.28	.043648	22.91
Brooklyn Tech.	.050733	19.71	.049962	20.02
Bushwick	.038324	26.09	.041338	24.19
Canarsie	.046066	21.71	.046753	21.39
Clara Barton	.052981	18.87	.051994	19.23
Eastern District	.041739	23.96	.040513	24.68
* East New York	.056788	17.61	.057238	17.47
Edward R. Murrow	.051060	19.58	.050981	19.62
* Eli Whitney	.053591	18.66	.053811	18.58
Erasmus Hall	.045698	21.88	.042495	23.53
Fort Hamilton	.042927	23.30	.043622	22.92
F.D. Roosevelt	.042848	23.34	.042325	23.63
Franklin K. Lane	.046002	21.74	.047550	21.03
* Geo. Westinghouse	.057340	17.44	.055453	18.03
Geo. W. Wingate	.043501	22.99	.044457	22.49
James Madison	.043742	22.86	.042285	23.65
John Dewey	.051273	19.50	.050089	19.96
John Jay	.043360	23.06	.042350	23.61
Lafayette	.044938	25.25	.045572	21.95
Midwood	.049593	20.16	.047010	21.27
New Utrecht	.044878	22.28	.044878	22.28
Prospect Heights	.041389	24.16	.042372	23.60
Samuel J. Tilden	.045154	22.15	.045453	22.00
Sarah J. Hale	.049244	20.31	.051135	19.56
Sheepshead Bay	.044308	22.57	.043672	22.90
South Shore	.046588	21.46	.046956	21.30
Thomas Jefferson	.038298	26.11	.039290	25.45
* Wm. E. Grady	.057717	17.33	.055972	17.87
* Wm. H. Maxwell	.053769	18.60	.051061	19.58

High School	Adjusted Audited Register Per Capita Allocation	Adjusted Audited Register # Students For 1 Unit	Estimated Register Per Capita Allocation	Estimated Register # Students For Every Unit
Andrew Jackson	.044769	22.34	.046400	21.55
August Martin	.054912	18.21	.052574	19.02
* Aviation	.054368	18.39	.055538	18.01
Bayside	.046244	21.62	.045562	21.95
Beach Channel	.049080	20.37	.049210	20.32
Benj. N. Cardozo	.047408	21.09	.047087	21.24
Far Rockaway	.046860	21.34	.047210	21.18
Flushing	.047151	21.21	.045725	21.87
Forest Hills	.045882	21.80	.046788	21.37
Francis Lewis	.043694	22.89	.044172	22.64
Grover Cleveland	.043098	23.20	.044436	22.50
Hillcrest	.049429	20.23	.048897	20.45
Jamaica	.048533	20.60	.048675	20.54
John Adams	.043300	23.09	.042829	23.35
John Bowne	.045406	22.02	.044728	22.36
Long Island City	.043234	23.13	.042953	23.28
Martin Van Buren	.045877	21.80	.046098	21.69
Newtown	.042186	23.70	.043210	23.14
* Queens	.062587	15.98	.059210	16.89
Richmond Hill	.048146	20.77	.045587	21.94
Springfield Gdns.	.046211	21.64	.045808	21.83
* Thomas A. Edison	.057088	17.52	.055263	18.10
William C. Bryant	.043070	23.22	.043968	22.74
* Art and Design	.057078	17.52	.056061	17.84
Benjamin Franklin	.036685	27.26	.043253	23.12
Chas E. Hughes	.044991	22.23	.043896	22.78
* Chelsea	.061210	16.34	.059385	16.84
* Fashion Industries	.060386	16.56	.053792	18.59
George Washington	.037545	26.63	.041053	24.36
H.S. Music & Art	.053082	18.84	.053585	18.66
Julia Richman	.040960	24.41	.040574	24.65
Louis D. Brandeis	.042452	23.56	.042549	23.50
* Mabel D. Bacon	.056885	17.58	.055728	17.94
* Manhattan	.054733	18.27	.055587	17.99
Martin L. King Jr.	.047628	21.00	.049274	20.29
Murry Bergtraum	.051657	19.36	.050482	19.81
* N.Y. Printing	.055953	17.87	.057209	17.48
Norman Thomas	.049742	20.10	.050305	19.88
Park West	.039920	25.05	.050224	19.91
Seward Park	.042448	23.56	.042226	23.68
Stuyvesant	.051801	19.30	.051317	19.49
Washington Irving	.047059	21.25	.045747	21.86

High School	Adjusted Audited Register Per Capita Allocation	Adjusted Audited Register # Students For 1 Unit	Estimated Register Per Capita Allocation	Estimated Register # Students For Every Unit
Adlai Stevenson	.042199	23.70	.044490	22.48
* Alfred E. Smith	.058609	17.06	.054633	18.30
Bronx H.S. Science	.051341	19.48	.050291	19.88
C. Columbus	.044167	22.64	.046351	21.57
DeWitt Clinton	.043678	22.89	.043337	23.07
Evander Childs	.041806	23.92	.045008	22.22
* Grace Dodge	.053596	18.66	.053265	18.77
Harry S. Truman	.046927	21.31	.047338	21.12
Herbert Lehman	.043754	22.86	.044787	22.33
James Monroe	.045004	22.22	.045747	21.86
* Jane Addams	.055385	18.06	.054545	18.33
John F. Kennedy	.043805	22.83	.044999	22.22
Morris	.042596	23.48	.045792	21.84
* Samuel Gompers	.058022	17.23	.058964	16.96
South Bronx	.068058	14.69	.062119	16.10
Theo. Roosevelt	.042286	23.65	.042527	23.51
Walton	.045110	22.17	.044405	22.52
William H. Taft	.041878	23.88	.039674	25.21
Curtis	.047441	21.08	.047632	20.99
New Dorp	.047124	21.22	.046221	21.64
Port Richmond	.045653	21.90	.045322	22.06
* Ralph McKee	.059507	16.80	.057989	17.24
Susan E. Wagner	.045938	21.77	.045356	22.05
Tottenville	.047620	21.00	.047402	21.10
AVERAGE	.046948	21.30	.046929	21.31

columns of Table 2, produces the following range:

lowest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 26.38 students
highest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 15.88 students
average per capita allocation = 1 unit per 21.53 students

The figures for Fall 1978 continue to reveal this disparity in funding. The first two columns of Table 3, based on the adjusted audited registers and the net-units (PSEN units and discrete units) can be compared to Table 2.

lowest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 27.26 students
highest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 14.78 students
average per capita allocation = 1 unit per 21.30 students

These figures are all based on the actual registers as of October 31. However, since the allocation is distributed in advance of the semester, based on an estimated register; the third and fourth columns of Table 3 recompute the per capita allocation based on these estimates. (Obviously, the difference between per capita rates based on estimated and audited registers reflects the accuracy of the estimate.)

lowest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 25.45 students
highest per capita allocation = 1 unit per 16.10 students
average per capita allocation = 1 unit per 21.31 students

Appendix II provides further statistical documentation of the association between a school's per capita allocation and curriculum index.

III. EQUITY

As stated above, equity does not mean that exactly the same amount of money must be spent on every child.

> Stated differently, it would be necessary to allocate resources in proportion to 'educational need,' where 'need' refers to the amount of resources per pupil, relative to the amount required in an 'average' district, to produce a given level of educational achievement.[2]

Just as additional PSEN units are allocated for students with special needs, other schools demand additional units in order to provide the special programs that they promise. Vocational schools have unique funding requirements in order to meet their mandates. The special high schools also have a commitment to the gifted and talented students that must be met.

However, a school's special programs should be funded with discrete units, not from the basic formula. An allocation formula should provide all students with the minimum of regular daily services before allotting additional funds for special needs. The present structure of the forumula, based on the curriculum index, means that those schools which offer fewer courses will be maintained at the same level of funding, unless the school can manage to increase the daily pupil load without additional resources.

As a final note, if the argument is presented that different course loads are appropriate for different students, it would appear that the same would hold true for the number of basic support units required by different student bodies. While one group of students may not be capable of successfully completing 7 academic subjects, it may be that they require remediation, job counseling, or the services of a family para. However, while the school receives fewer instuctional units based on the specific educational program of the school, basic support units do not vary according to the specific educational program in order to provide the kind of additional support services noted above. Either, both components of the formula (basic support and instructional

supervision) should consider the relative needs of each student body; or the formula should allocate funds on a strict per capita basis, relying upon discrete units to fund special programs. The next, and final chapter, explores the second alternative.

NOTES

1. Board of Education of the City of New York, Division of High Schools. Memo: 1978-79 High School Personal Service Allocation Formula, p. 1.

2. Board of Education of the City of New York, Allocating Resources in a Decentralized School System: The 1977-78 Allocation Formulae, Policy Paper No. 6, June 6, 1977, p. 3.

CHAPTER VIII

PROPOSED PER CAPITA ALLOCATION

The two previous chapters present the problems which result from the present unit allocation formula with its dependence on the curriculum index. A per capita allocation would both provide a more quitable allocation and allow the principal complete flexibility in designing an educational program. However, because of the range, at present, in both the curriculum index and per capita allocation of the different schools, any revision in the formula would, necessarily, help some schools and hurt others.

Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate the impact a per capita allocation would have had on the Fall 1978 allotments. Table 1 is based on the audited registers, as of October 31. Table 2 uses the estimated registers, the actual basis for allocation. The first column contains the register figure (audited or estimated). The per capita allocation was arrived at by taking the total units distributed minus discrete and PSEN units and dividing this figure by the total register:

Table 1) Audited Adjusted Register - $\frac{13,182.46 \text{ units}}{280,788 \text{ students}} = .04695$

Table 2) Estimated Register - $\frac{13,182.46 \text{ units}}{280,900 \text{ students}} = .04693$

The base per capita allocation was then computed and the PSEN funds added back in, since PSEN funds must be given to the targeted students. This figure is comparable to the net allocation actually received less discrete units, the figure in the third column (discrete units are listed in Table 2 in Chapter II, the section covering discrete units). The final column reflects the loss or gain which each school would sustain from a per capita allocation.

TABLE 1

PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTION OF UNITS - FALL 1978

BASED ON ADJUSTED AUDITED REGISTERS - 10/31/78

* Denotes Vocational-Technical School

High School	Audited Adjusted Register	Per Capita[1] + PSEN	Net Received - Discretes	Loss or Gain
Abraham Lincoln	2718	132.61	129.27	+ 3.34
* Alex Hamilton	1234	63.54	89.10	-25.56
* Automotive	1666	83.42	99.02	-15.60
Bay Ridge	2145	108.51	107.69	+ .82
Boys and Girls	4020	206.14	215.65	- 9.51
Brooklyn Tech.	5771	272.55	294.38	-21.83
Bushwick	2757	140.24	116.46	+23.78
Canarsie	2519	122.87	120.64	+ 2.23
Clara Barton	2318	111.63	125.61	-13.98
Eastern District	2479	128.99	116.07	+12.92
* East New York	1653	83.81	100.07	-16.26
Edward R. Murrow	2565	122.83	133.37	-10.54
* Eli Whitney	2208	110.67	125.33	-14.66
Erasmus Hall	3887	196.89	192.03	+ 4.86
Fort Hamilton	3574	174.20	159.82	+14.38
F.D. Roosevelt	3803	187.15	171.55	+15.60
Franklin K. Lane	4792	237.98	233.44	+ 4.54
* Geo. Westinghouse	2233	111.24	134.44	-23.20
Geo. W. Wingate	3208	163.22	152.15	+11.07
James Madison	3135	153.59	143.53	+10.06
John Dewey	3387	162.22	176.86	-14.64
John Jay	3940	199.38	185.24	+14.14
Lafayette	3236	159.73	153.22	+ 6.51
Midwood	2676	130.04	137.11	- 7.07
New Utrecht	2706	132.45	126.84	+ 5.61
Prospect Heights	2887	147.14	131.09	+16.05
Samuel J. Tilden	2734	133.76	128.85	+ 4.91
Sarah J. Hale	2406	123.36	128.88	- 5.52
Sheepshead Bay	2955	143.14	135.33	+ 7.81
South Shore	4344	210.75	209.18	+ 1.57
Thomas Jefferson	3643	186.84	155.32	+31.52
* Wm. E. Grady	2085	101.69	124.14	-22.45
* Wm. H. Maxwell	1754	89.55	101.51	-11.96
	(97,438)	(4,832.13	(4,853.19)	(-21.06)

[1] $\frac{13,182.46 \text{ units (net - (PSEN \& Discretes))}}{280,788 \text{ Total Register (Audited)}} = .04695$ per capita

Figures do not reflect penalties ≈ 40 units

High School	Audited Adjusted Register	Per Capita + PSEN	Net Received - Discretes	Loss or Gain
Andrew Jackson	2617	130.27	124.56	+ 5.71
August Martin	1934	94.40	109.80	-15.40
* Aviation	2704	129.15	149.21	-20.06
Bayside	3610	174.49	171.94	+ 2.55
Beach Channel	3412	165.39	172.66	- 7.27
Benj. N. Cardozo	2932	141.66	143.00	- 1.34
Far Rockaway	2156	106.22	106.03	+ .19
Flushing	2534	124.97	125.48	- .51
Forest Hills	2273	109.92	107.49	+ 2.43
Francis Lewis	2864	138.26	128.94	+ 9.32
Grover Cleveland	3951	194.50	179.28	+15.22
Hillcrest	3032	147.75	155.27	- 7.52
Jamaica	3088	148.78	150.50	- 1.72
John Adams	4539	221.51	204.94	+16.57
John Bowne	3698	181.22	175.51	+ 5.71
Long Island City	3203	156.78	144.88	+11.90
Martin Van Buren	3337	160.87	157.29	+ 3.58
Newtown	4474	220.05	198.74	+21.31
* Queens	1210	59.61	78.53	-18.92
Richmond Hill	2637	129.81	132.96	- 3.15
Springfield Gdns.	3067	150.20	147.93	+ 2.27
* Thomas A. Edison	2301	110.83	134.16	-23.33
William C. Bryant	3671	181.35	167.11	+14.24
Sub-total	(69,244)	(3,377.99)	(3,366.21)	(+11.78)
* Art and Design	2259	108.06	130.94	-22.88
Benjamin Franklin	1765	89.27	71.15	+18.12
Chas E. Hughes	2244	116.76	112.36	+ 4.40
* Chelsea	1041	52.47	67.32	-14.85
* Fashion Industries	2382	119.63	151.64	-32.01
George Washington	3043	154.47	125.85	+28.62
H.S. Music & Art	2451	115.87	130.85	-14.98
Julia Richman	3157	159.22	140.31	+18.91
Louis D. Brandeis	3924	200.63	182.98	+17.65
* Mabel D. Bacon	1252	61.38	73.82	-12.44
* Manhattan	1496	75.84	87.48	-11.64
Martin L. King Jr.	2365	119.24	120.84	- 1.60
Murry Bergtraum	2492	119.80	131.53	-11.73
* N.Y. Printing	1685	83.91	99.08	-15.17
Norman Thomas	2951	141.75	149.99	- 8.24
Park West	3763	191.07	164.62	+26.45
Seward Park	3247	164.45	149.83	+14.62
Stuyvesant	2754	129.30	142.66	-13.36
Washington Irving	2336	119.08	119.33	- .25
Sub-total	(46,607)	(2,322.20)	(2,352.58)	(-30.38)

High School	Audited Adjusted Register	Per Capita + PSEN	Net Received - Discretes	Loss or Gain
Adlai Stevenson	4116	203.85	184.29	+19.56
* Alfred E. Smith	1690	85.95	105.65	-19.70
Bronx H.S. Science	3304	155.12	169.63	-14.51
C. Columbus	2928	142.47	134.32	+ 8.15
DeWitt Clinton	3937	199.04	186.16	+12.88
Evander Childs	3190	157.77	141.36	+16.41
* Grace Dodge	1927	94.27	107.08	-12.81
Harry S. Truman	3228	157.15	157.08	+ .07
Herbert Lehman	3079	151.36	141.52	+ 9.84
James Monroe	2462	125.79	121.00	+ 4.79
* Jane Addams	1495	76.19	88.80	-12.61
John F. Kennedy	4560	224.09	209.75	+14.34
Morris	2450	123.63	112.96	+10.67
* Samuel Gompers	1001	50.60	61.68	-11.08
South Bronx	659	33.94	47.85	-13.91
Theo. Roosevelt	3884	195.15	177.04	+18.11
Walton	3084	156.19	150.52	+ 5.67
William H. Taft	3691	190.29	171.57	+18.72
Sub-total	(50,685)	(2,522.85)	(2,468.26)	(+54.59)
Curtis	2243	109.11	110.21	- 1.10
New Dorp	2663	128.03	128.49	- .46
Port Richmond	2928	141.47	137.70	+ 3.77
* Ralph McKee	1299	64.39	80.70	-16.31
Susan E. Wagner	2883	138.96	136.04	+ 2.92
Tottenville	4798	230.67	233.88	- 3.21
Sub-total	(1[illegible]81)	(812.63)	(827.02)	(-14.39)
GRAND TOTAL	280,788	13,867.80	13,867.26	+ .54

TABLE 1A

UNITS NECESSARY TO PREVENT LOSSES FROM

PER CAPITA REALLOCATION

FALL 1978 - ADJUSTED AUDITED REGISTERS

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Assuming No Loss
Abraham Lincoln	-
* Alex Hamilton	25.56
* Automotive	15.60
Bay Ridge	-
Boys and Girls	9.51
Brooklyn Tech.	21.83
Bushwick	-
Canarsie	-
Clara Barton	13.98
Eastern District	-
* East New York	16.26
Edward R. Murrow	10.54
* Eli Whitney	14.66
Erasmus Hall	-
Fort Hamilton	-
F.D. Roosevelt	-
Franklin K. Lane	-
* Geo. Westinghouse	23.20
Geo. W. Wingate	-
James Madison	-
John Dewey	14.64
John Jay	-
Lafayette	-
Midwood	7.07
New Utrecht	-
Prospect Heights	-
Samuel J. Tilden	-
Sarah J. Hale	5.52
Sheepshead Bay	-
South Shore	-
Thomas Jefferson	-
* Wm. E. Grady	22.45
* Wm. H. Maxwell	11.96
	(212.78)

High School	Assuming No Loss
Andrew Jackson	-
August Martin	15.40
* Aviation	20.06
Bayside	-
Beach Channel	7.27
Benj. N. Cardozo	1.34
Far Rockaway	-
Flushing	.51
Forest Hills	-
Francis Lewis	-
Grover Cleveland	-
Hillcrest	7.52
Jamaica	1.72
John Adams	-
John Bowne	-
Long Island City	-
Martin Van Buren	-
Newtown	-
* Queens	18.92
Richmond Hill	3.15
Springfield Gdns.	-
* Thomas A. Edison	23.33
William C. Bryant	-
	(99.22)
* Art and Design	22.88
Benjamin Franklin	-
Chas E. Hughes	-
* Chelsea	14.85
* Fashion Industries	32.01
George Washington	-
H.S. Music & Art	14.98
Julia Richman	-
Louis D. Brandeis	-
* Mabel D. Bacon	12.44
* Manhattan	11.64
Martin L. King Jr.	1.60
Murry Bergtraum	11.73
* N.Y. Printing	15.17
Norman Thomas	8.24
Park West	-
Seward Park	-
Stuyvesant	13.36
Washington Irving	.25
	(159.15)

High School	Assuming No Loss
Adlai Stevenson	-
* Alfred E. Smith	19.70
Bronx H.S. Science	14.51
C. Columbus	-
DeWitt Clinton	-
Evander Childs	-
* Grace Dodge	12.81
Harry S. Truman	-
Herbert Lehman	-
James Monroe	-
* Jane Addams	12.61
John F. Kennedy	-
Morris	-
* Samuel Gompers	11.08
South Bronx	13.91
Theo. Roosevelt	-
Walton	-
William H. Taft	-
	(84.62)
Curtis	1.10
New Dorp	.46
Port Richmond	-
* Ralph McKee	16.31
Susan E. Wagner	-
Tottenville	3.21
	(21.08)
TOTAL	576.85

TABLE 2

PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTION OF UNITS - FALL 1978

BASED ON ESTIMATED REGISTERS

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Final Estimate	Per Capita[1] & PSEN	Net Received - Discretes	Loss or Gain
Abraham Lincoln	2767	134.86	129.27	+ 5.59
* Alex Hamilton	1500	76.00	89.10	-13.10
* Automotive	1636	81.98	99.02	-17.04
Bay Ridge	2110	106.82	107.69	- .87
Boys and Girls	4542	230.56	215.65	+14.91
Brooklyn Tech.	5860	276.61	294.38	-17.77
Bushwick	2556	130.75	116.46	+14.29
Carnarsie	2482	121.08	120.64	+ .44
Clara Barton	2362	113.65	125.61	-11.96
Eastern District	2554	132.46	116.07	+16.39
* East New York	1640	83.16	100.07	-16.91
Edward R. Murrow	2569	122.96	133.37	-10.41
* Eli Whitney	2199	110.20	125.33	-15.13
Erasmus Hall	4180	210.57	192.03	+18.54
Fort Hamilton	3517	171.45	159.82	+11.63
F.D. Roosevelt	3850	189.28	171.55	+17.73
Franklin K. Lane	4636	230.57	233.44	- 2.87
* Geo. Westinghouse	2309	114.76	134.44	-19.68
Geo. Wingate	3139	159.91	152.15	+ 7.76
James Madison	3243	158.59	143.53	+15.06
John Dewey	3467	165.91	176.86	-10.95
John Jay	4034	203.72	185.24	+18.48
Lafayette	3191	157.55	153.22	+ 4.33
Midwood	2823	136.88	137.11	- .23
New Utrecht	2706	132.39	126.84	+ 5.55
Prospect Heights	2820	143.94	131.09	+12.85
Samuel J. Tilden	2716	132.86	128.85	+ 4.01
Sarah J. Hale	2317	119.14	128.88	- 9.74
Sheepshead Bay	2998	145.10	135.33	+ 9.77
South Shore	4310	209.07	209.18	- .11
Thomas Jefferson	3551	182.45	155.32	+27.13
* Wm. E. Grady	2150	104.70	124.14	-19.44
* Wm. H. Maxwell	1847	93.88	101.51	- 7.63
Sub-total	(98,581)	(4,883.81)	(4,853.19)	(+30.62)

[1] $\frac{13,182.46 \text{ units (net-(PSEN \& Discretes))}}{280,900 \text{ Total Register - Estimated}} = .04693$ per capita

figures do not reflect penalties ≈ 40 units

High School	Final Estimate	Per Capita[1] & PSEN	Net Received - Discretes	Loss or Gain
Andrew Jackson	2525	125.90	124.56	+ 1.34
August Martin	2020	98.40	109.80	-11.40
* Aviation	2647	126.42	149.21	-22.79
Bayside	3664	176.95	171.94	+ 5.01
Beach Channel	3403	164.90	172.66	- 7.76
Benj. N. Cardozo	2952	142.54	143.00	- .46
Far Rockaway	2140	105.43	106.03	- .60
Flushing	2613	128.63	125.48	+ 3.15
Forest Hills	2229	107.81	107.49	+ .32
Francis Lewis	2833	136.75	128.94	+ 7.81
Grover Cleveland	3832	188.84	179.28	+ 9.56
Hillcrest	3065	149.24	155.27	- 6.03
Jamaica	3079	148.30	150.50	- 2.20
John Adams	4589	223.76	204.94	+18.82
John Bowne	3754	183.78	175.51	+ 8.27
Long Island City	3224	157.70	144.88	+12.82
Martin Van Buren	3321	160.05	157.29	+ 2.76
Newtown	4368	215.00	198.74	+16.26
* Queens	1279	62.82	78.53	-15.71
Richmond Hill	2785	136.70	132.96	+ 3.74
Springfield Gdns.	3094	151.40	147.93	+ 3.47
* Thomas A. Edison	2377	114.35	134.16	-19.81
William C. Bryant	3596	177.76	167.11	+10.65
Sub-total	(69,389)	(3,383.43)	(3,366.21)	(+17.22)
* Art and Design	2300	107.94	130.94	-21.00
Benjamin Franklin	1497	70.25	71.15	+ 5.50
Chas E. Hughes	2300	107.94	112.36	+ 6.98
* Chelsea	1073	50.36	67.32	-13.36
* Fashion Industries	2674	125.49	151.64	-18.35
George Washington	2783	130.61	125.85	+16.36
H.S. Music & Art	2427	113.90	130.85	-16.15
Julia Richman	3187	149.57	140.31	+20.26
Louis D. Brandeis	3915	183.73	182.98	+17.15
* Mabel D. Bacon	1278	59.98	73.82	-11.24
* Manhattan	1473	69.13	87.48	-12.75
Martin L. King Jr.	2286	107.28	120.84	- 5.36
Murry Bergtraum	2550	119.67	131.53	- 9.06
* N.Y. Printing	1648	77.34	99.08	-16.94
Norman Thomas	2918	136.94	149.99	- 9.85
Park West	2991	140.37	164.62	- 9.85
Seward Park	3261	153.14	149.83	+15.21
Stuyvesant	2780	130.47	142.66	-12.19
Washington Irving	2403	112.77	119.33	+ 2.84
Sub-total	(45,744)	(2,146,78)	(2,352.58)	(-71.80)

High School	Final Estimate	Per Capita[1] & PSEN	Net Received - Discretes	Loss or Gain
Adlai Stevenson	3904	183.21	184.29	+ 9.52
* Alfred E. Smith	1813	85.08	105.65	-13.97
Bronx H.S. Science	3373	158.29	169.63	-11.34
C. Columbus	2790	130.93	134.32	+ 1.61
DeWitt Clinton	3968	186.22	186.16	+14.26
Evander Childs	2963	139.05	141.36	+ 5.69
* Grace Dodge	1939	91.00	107.08	-12.28
Harry S. Truman	3200	150.18	157.08	- 1.30
Herbert Lehman	3008	141.17	141.52	+ 6.45
James Monroe	2422	113.66	121.00	+ 2.86
* Jane Addams	1518	71.24	88.80	-11.56
John F. Kennedy	4439	208.32	209.75	+ 8.57
Morris	2279	106.95	112.96	+ 2.59
* Samuel Gompers	985	46.23	61.68	-11.85
South Bronx	722	33.88	47.85	-10.97
Theo. Roosevelt	3862	181.24	177.04	+17.00
Walton	3133	147.03	150.52	+ 7.91
William H. Taft	3896	182.84	171.57	+28.27
Sub-total	(50,214)	(2,356.52)	(2,468.26)	(+31.46)
Curtis	2234	104.84	110.21	- 1.57
New Dorp	2715	127.41	128.49	+ 1.92
Port Richmond	2950	138.44	137.70	+ 4.74
* Ralph McKee	1333	62.56	80.70	-14.74
Susan E. Wagner	2920	138.44	136.04	+ 6.00
Tottenville	4820	226.20	233.88	- 2.28
Sub-total	(16,972)	(797.89)	(827.02)	(- 5.93)
TOTAL	(280,900)	(13,184.03)	(13,867.26)	(- 1.57)

[1] $\frac{13,182.46 \text{ units (net- (PSEN \& Discretes)}}{280,900 \text{ Total Register - Estimated}} = .04693$ per capita

figures do not reflect penalties ≈ 40 units

TABLE 2A

UNITS NECESSARY TO PREVENT LOSSES FROM

PER CAPITA REALLOCATION

FALL 1978 - ESTIMATED REGISTERS

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Assuming No Loss
Abraham Lincoln	-
* Alex Hamilton	13.10
* Automotive	17.04
Bay Ridge	.87
Boys and Girls	-
Brooklyn Tech.	17.77
Bushwick	-
Canarsie	-
Clara Barton	11.96
Eastern District	-
* East New York	16.91
Edward R. Murrow	10.41
* Eli Whitney	15.13
Erasmus Hall	-
Fort Hamilton	-
F.D. Roosevelt	-
Franklin K. Lane	2.87
* Geo. Westinghouse	19.68
Geo. W. Wingate	-
James Madison	-
John Dewey	10.95
John Jay	-
Lafayette	-
Midwood	.23
New Utrecht	-
Prospect Heights	-
Samuel J. Tilden	-
Sarah J. Hale	9.74
Sheepshead Bay	-
South Shore	.11
Thomas Jefferson	-
* Wm. E. Grady	19.44
* Wm. H. Maxwell	7.63
	(173.84)

High School	Assuming No Loss
Andrew Jackson	-
August Martin	11.40
* Aviation	22.79
Bayside	-
Beach Channel	7.76
Benj. N. Cardozo	.46
Far Rockaway	.60
Flushing	-
Forest Hills	-
Francis Lewis	-
Grover Cleveland	-
Hillcrest	6.03
Jamaica	2.20
John Adams	-
John Bowne	-
Long Island City	-
Martin Van Buren	-
Newtown	-
* Queens	15.71
Richmond Hill	-
Springfield Gdns.	-
* Thomas A. Edison	19.81
William C. Bryant	-
	(86.76)
* Art and Design	21.00
Benjamin Franklin	-
Chas E. Hughes	-
* Chelsea	13.36
* Fashion Industries	18.35
George Washington	-
H.S. Music & Art	16.15
Julia Richman	-
Louis D. Brandeis	-
* Mabel D. Bacon	11.24
* Manhattan	12.75
Martin L. King Jr.	5.36
Murry Bergtraum	9.06
* N.Y. Printing	16.94
Norman Thomas	9.85
Park West	9.85
Seward Park	-
Stuyvesant	12.19
Washington Irving	-
	(156.10)

High School	Assuming No Loss
Adlai Stevenson	-
* Alfred E. Smith	13.97
Bronx H.S. Science	11.34
C. Columbus	-
DeWitt Clinton	-
Evander Childs	-
* Grace Dodge	12.28
Harry S. Truman	1.30
Herbert Lehman	-
James Monroe	-
* Jane Addams	11.56
John F. Kennedy	-
Morris	-
* Samuel Gompers	11.85
South Bronx	10.97
Theo. Roosevelt	-
Walton	-
William H. Taft	-
	(73.27)
Curtis	1.57
New Dorp	-
Port Richmond	-
* Ralph McKee	14.74
Susan E. Wagner	-
Tottenville	2.28
	(18.59)
TOTAL	508.56

The Educational Priorities Panel recommends that the unit allocation formula be revised to provide an equitable distribution of tax levy funds to the high schools. In accomplishing this revision in the formula, no single high school should be hurt, since every school has sustained repeated budget cuts for the past four years. This recommendation can only be implemented with the necessary additional funds, or phased in gradually.

In this and previous studies, the Educational Priorities Panel has identified areas of waste and mismanagement at the Board of Education. The Panel has been instrumental, through its recommendations and testimony, in achieving the reallocation of $83 million into instructional areas over the last 3 years. The Community School Districts and the Department of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services have enjoyed the benefits of all of this money (for transitional classes, reduced class size in the first grade, etc.). In fact, the only instructional program that has not yet received a major reallocation of funds is the high schools. The Panel has identified the high schools as a priority for any funds which become available through management savings. From this perspective, we feel that it is consistent with our position to request additional funds in order to provide equity and improved education for <u>all</u> New York City high school students.

We recommend a per capita allocation, incorporating school aide hours and CTPS funds as suggested in Chapter VI. A per capita allocation would both provide a more equitable allocation and allow the principal complete flexibility in designing an educaticnal program. Units would not be earmarked for any specific positions, but would be targeted to ensure that services were provided to every student on the register, as noted in the recommendations on attendance. Equity does not mean that each student would benefit from, or should receive, identical services. A per capita allocation would be equitable with the flexibility to provide appropriate services (pp. 129-143), overccming the problems caused by the present dependance on the curriculum index.

Because of the range, at present, in both the curriculum index and per capita distribution of funds for the different schools, any revision in the formula would, necessarily, help some schools and hurt others. Repeated cuts in the budget of the Division of High Schools, appearing as a budget adjustment or below-the-line cut for each school, mean that all of the high schools

continue to operate under severe fiscal constraints. None of these schools can afford substantial reductions in funding. Our recommendation is to upgrade those schools which have been penalized under the current formula. In order to ensure that no school suffers, an additional 508.56 units or $9,636,720 is required to institute a per capita allocation. These funds would insure that no school's allocation would drop from its current level as a result of a per capita shift.

It should also be noted that an inequity exists state-wide regarding vocational schools, which might be exacerbated by a shift to a per capita allocation. If BOCES funds, currently reserved for non New York City school districts, were made available to New York City as well, the special needs of vocational education could be funded, lending impetus to the recommended shift to a per capita allocation.

Our recommendation is premised on the right of every student to a minimum level of education services.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I	School Profiles
APPENDIX II	Statistical correlations
APPENDIX III	Reimbursable Positions, Fall term, 1978

APPENDIX I

PROFILES OF THE NEW YORK CITY ACADEMIC - COMPREHENSIVE

AND VOCATIONAL - TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOLS

NOTES

[1]Park West is not included as it was opened in September, 1978, combining Food and Maritime and Haaren.

Explanation of columns and codes:

Those schools with asterisks (*) were the schools visited in the sample.

Type of school: This refers to the programs offered, and was taken from the Directory of Public High Schools, 1978-79.

X These schools require a general entrance exam.

S These schools require exams for special programs such as screened vocational courses.

SA These academic schools offer special courses which require entrance exams.

EO These schools offer Educational Options programs

Percentage Utilization:

This column is based on data from School Profiles, 1976-1977, and is a measure of the usage of a school building in relation to its rated capacity. These figures are the most current ones available at this time. (Note: because South Bronx High School was not open until 1977, no data is included).

For those students where the register and capacity data do not involve the same structures, the percent utilization was not calculated. This is true for schools which have temporary buildings, and is indicated by (-).

The Allocation Register or Adjusted Audited Register is for the fall of 1978, and is taken from the Register and Attendance forms at the Division of High Schools.

The Attendance is a percent figure for the school year 1977-78, received from the Office of Educational Statistics.

Title I: A check indicates that for the school year 1977-78, this school was eligible for Title I funds.

Percent PSEN indicates those student two or more years retarded in reading or math, and the figure for each school was drawn from the Preliminary Allocation of Budget Capability - Fall Term 1978.

The Year Built column states the year that the school was constructed, as noted in the school profiles, 1976-77.

A indicates an addition was made to the school.

M indicates that the school was modernized at that time.

Ethnicity is broken down into three areas: Black, Hispanic (including Puerto Rican and other Spanish speaking people) and Other (including Oriental and American Indian.) Any error in percent total is due to rounding. The figures are compiled from the School Profiles, 1976-77.

The Curriculum Index is for the year 1978-79, and was taken from the Preliminary Allocation of Budget Capability - Fall Term 1978.

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
MANHATTAN									
ART AND DESIGN	Vocational Performance X	127.1	2,259	84.30	✓	13.6	1960	29.5/26.5/43.9	7.0
BENJAMIN FRANKLIN	Academic	—	1,765	61.34	✓	71.1	1942	51.1/48.1/0.8	5.36
CHARLES E. HUGHES	Academic SA	—	2,244	63.13	✓	80.7	1931 M - 1969	72.8/25.0/2.2	5.65
CHELSEA	Vocational S	118.3	1,041	76.58	✓	53.5	1905	21.8/41.1/37	6.79
FASHION INDUSTRIES	Vocational Performance X	113.5	2,382	86.63	✓	48.3	1940	71.9/23.7/4.4	6.89
LAGUARDIA HIGH SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND ART	Performance X	—	2,451	82.35		5.6	1926 M - 1954	43.3/14.8/41.9	7.00
GEORGE WASHINGTON	Academic	—	3,043	73.00	✓	68.4	1925 M - 1965	21.2/73.0/5.8	5.45
JULIA RICHMAN	Academic EO	—	3,157	73.18	✓	56.7	1924 M - 1963	50.3/42.3/7.4	5.35
*LOUIS D. BRANDEIS	Academic	—	3,924	79.68	✓	68.7	1965	51.9/44.5/3.7	5.82
MABEL D. BACON	Vocational S	121.1	1,252	86.74	✓	34.4	1918 M - 1963	40.2/50.6/9.3	6.77
HATTAN VOC-TECH	Vocational S	111.5	1,496	61.80	✓	62.8	1942	50.3/44.9/4.8	6.64

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
MANHATTAN									
MARTIN L. KING	Academic	55.6	2,365	75.12	✓	58.6	1976	76.9/20.2/2.9	6.69
MURRAY BERGTRAUM	Academic EO	42.1	2,492	87.97	✓	18.2	1975	44.4/28.1/27.5	6.83
NY PRINTING	Vocational S-All	112.5	1,685	75.88	✓	48.7	1958	46.8/41.3/11.9	6.94
NORMAN THOMAS	Academic EO	110.9	2,951	83.53	✓	17.8	1976	48.8/41.5/9.6	6.96
PARK WEST[1]									
SEWARD PARK	Academic	—	3,247	75.44	✓	60.5	1930	20.4/47.3/32.3	5.65
STUYVESANT	Academic X	109.4	2,754	92.16		0	1906 M - 1956	10.2/4.0/85.8	7.00
WASHINGTON IRVING	Academic SA EO	62.7	2,336	72.07	✓	63.5	1913 M - 1938	41.1/44.8/14.1	5.92

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
THE BRONX									
ADLAI E. STEVENSON	ACADEMIC	113.2	4,116	73.45	✓	44.6	1970	42.6/52.4/4.9	6.20
ALFRED E. SMITH	VOCATIONAL S	127.8	1,690	77.14	✓	60.1	1933	35.4/60.9/3.7	6.74
THE BRONX HIGH SCHOOL OF SCIENCE	ACADEMIC X	114.9	3,304	89.29		0	1959	13.9/9.5/76.5	7.00
CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS	ACADEMIC	105.9	2,928	76.89		29.8	1939	20.7/16.1/63.2	6.23
*DeWITT CLINTON	ACADEMIC	100.6	3,937	61.01	✓	58.7	1929	50.8/42.9/6.3	6.00
*EVANDER CHILDS	ACADEMIC SA	89.1	3,190	72.08	✓	44.5	1930 A - 1932 M - 1962	63.5/22.3/14.3	6.12
GRACE DODGE	VOCATIONAL S	126.7	1,927	85.52	✓	32.9	1925 A - 1956 M - 1956	36.6/56.2/7.2	6.90
HARRY S. TRUMAN	ACADEMIC	82.0	3,228	76.47		29.0	1973	48.0/14.2/37.7	6.52

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
THE BRONX									
HERBERT LEHMAN	ACADEMIC	103.7	3,079	70.70		36.6	1972	20.8/21.3/57.8	6.18
JAMES MONROE	ACADEMIC	——	2,462	68.45	✓	68.4	1925 M - 1962	33.9/64.3/1.8	6.10
*JANE ADDAMS	VOCATIONAL S	123.5	1,495	71.24	✓	64.3	1937	46.3/52.9/0.8	6.70
*JOHN F. KENNEDY	ACADEMIC SA	117.7	4,560	74.45	✓	36.8	1972	39.4/27.6/33.0	6.28
MORRIS	ACADEMIC	——	2,450	69.23	✓	62.1	1901 M - 1952 A - 1954	41.2/58.5/0.5	6.08
SAMUEL GOMPERS	VOCATIONAL S	104.6	1,001	74.18	✓	59.2	1935	45.8/51.8/2.4	6.49
SOUTH BRONX	ACADEMIC	N/A	659	74.53	✓	67.1	1977	N/A	6.60
THEODORE ROOSEVELT	ACADEMIC	127.0	3,884	67.97	✓	54.4	1928	39.0/57.1/3.9	5.80

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
THE BRONX									
WALTON	ACADEMIC EO	58.2	3,084	66.28	✓	59.4	1932 M - 1962	47.9/46.0/6.2	6.03
WILLIAM H. TAFT	ACADEMIC	—	3,691	59.43	✓	71.9	1941	51.3/46.6/2.1	5.36

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
BROOKLYN									
ABRAHAM LINCOLN	ACADEMIC EO	101.0	2,718	77.62		30.0	1930 A - 1932	27.3/9.6/63.1	6.04
ALEXANDER HAMILTON	VOCATIONAL S	99.5	1,234	73.70	✓	60.3	1904 M - 1962	73.0/25.2/1.8	7.00
AUTOMOTIVE	VOCATIONAL S - ALL	128.4	1,666	81.36	✓	52.4	1938	34.3/42.3/23.4	6.89
BAY RIDGE	ACADEMIC	—	2,145	68.85	✓	60.6	1915 M - 1952	57.9/34.7/7.4	6.23
BOYS AND GIRLS	ACADEMIC EO	107.4	4,020	62.84	✓	62.6	1976	94.0/5.9/0.1	6.07
BROOKLYN TECH	ACADEMIC X	90.6	5,771	87.47	✓	4.2	1933 M - 1960	37.6/12.0/50.4	7.00
BUSHWICK	ACADEMIC	160.9	2,757	64.39	✓	69.3	1913 A - 1958 M - 1958	33.5/63.0/3.6	5.31
CANARSIE	ACADEMIC	104.6	2,519	72.66		31.0	1964	32.2/9.0/58.8	6.25

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
*CLARA BARTON	ACADEMIC EO	96.0	2,318	90.71	✓	19.2	1940 A - 1957	73.6/22.3/4.2	6.85
EASTERN DISTRICT	ACADEMIC	165.7	2,479	58.18	✓	80.3	1908	30.8/67.7/1.5	5.20
EAST NEW YORK	VOCATIONAL S	136.2	1,653	78.56	✓	62.8	1941	41.8/50.8/7.4	7.00
EDWARD R. MURROW	ACADEMIC EO	86.0	2,565	83.43		15.7	1975	21.4/12.3/66.3	7.00
ELI WHITNEY	VOCATIONAL S	142.0	2,208	81.82	✓	51.8	1903 A - 1957 M - 1957	52.6/45.5/11.8	6.89
ERASMUS HALL	ACADEMIC EO	103.6	3,887	78.40	✓	56.6	1905 A - 1911 M - 1958	75.4/13.3/11.4	5.88
FORT HAMILTON	ACADEMIC	151.3	3,574	79.89		30.0	1941	12.5/15.9/71.6	5.97
F.D. ROOSEVELT	ACADEMIC	135.7	3,803	72.89		36.3	1965	17.6/14.7/67.7	6.00

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
BROOKLYN									
FRANKLIN K. LANE	ACADEMIC	79.8	4,792	65.09	✓	45.8	1937	33.6/26.4/39.9	6.75
*GEORGE WESTINGHOUSE	VOCATIONAL S	115.2	2,233	86.16	✓	45.6	1908 A - 1962 M - 1962	63.3/27.8/8.9	7.00
GEORGE WINGATE	ACADEMIC	118.3	3,208	76.24	✓	65.5	1955	88.8/10.3/1.0	5.98
JAMES MADISON	ACADEMIC EO	—	3,135	73.48		32.2	1925 M - 1961	25.8/6.3/67.9	5.71
*JOHN DEWEY	ACADEMIC EO	113.7	3,387	83.39		15.4	1969	25.5/8.5/66.0	7.00
*JOHN JAY	ACADEMIC EO	152.3	3,940	60.97	✓	58.2	1903 A - 1939	21.5/45.0/33.4	5.70
LAFAYETTE	ACADEMIC	108.5	3,236	74.18		40.3	1939	22.1/8.6/69.2	6.37
MIDWOOD	ACADEMIC SA	—	2,676	83.02		25.7	1940	26.6/6.5/66.9	6.42

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
BROOKLYN									
NEW UTRECHT	ACADEMIC	113.5	2,706	72.18		32.8	1924	17.5/2.7/79.7	5.98
PROSPECT HEIGHTS	ACADEMIC	111.8	2,887	68.25	✓	67.6	1924	88.5/10.4/1.1	5.68
SAMUEL J. TILDEN	ACADEMIC EO	91.2	2,734	80.38		32.2	1930	55.5/7.1/37.4	6.14
SARAH J. HALE	ACADEMIC EO	131.8	2,406	67.35	✓	73.4	1930	42.4/45.6/12.1	6.75
SHEEPSHEAD BAY	ACADEMIC	92.6	2,955	76.05		24.0	1959	26.4/4.8/68.8	5.84
SOUTH SHORE	ACADEMIC	130.5	4,344	75.73		26.2	1970	36.6/5.6/57.7	6.57
*THOMAS JEFFERSON	ACADEMIC EO	140.8	3,643	59.80	✓	73.4	1924 M - 1958	69.3/30.5/0.1	5.30
WILLIAM E. GRADY	VOCATIONAL S	118.0	2,085	79.80	✓	29.3	1957	14.4/7.9/77.7	7.00
,IAM H. MAXWELL	VOCATIONAL S	183.8	1,754	76.16	✓	64.3	1913	39.8/52.4/8.0	6.80

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
QUEENS									
ANDREW JACKSON	ACADEMIC SA EO	83.7	2,617	72.79	✓	48.4	1937	96.5/3.1/0.3	6.20
AUGUST MARTIN	ACADEMIC EO	85.0	1934	87.30	✓	29.1	1942	88.2/9.7/2.2	6.91
*AVIATION	VOCATIONAL S-ALL	138.3	2,704	89.95	✓	13.0	1958	16.1/41.6/42.4	7.00
BAYSIDE	ACADEMIC	117.6	3,610	82.10		22.6	1936	30.7/3.0/66.2	6.30
BEACH CHANNEL	ACADEMIC EO	80.6	3,412	81.94	✓	24.9	1973	25.2/9.3/65.4	6.85
BENJAMIN N. CARDOZO	ACADEMIC	98.7	2,932	82.17		22.1	1967	40.6/3.9/55.5	6.40
FAR ROCKAWAY	ACADEMIC SA EO	70.4	2,156	73.87		38.5	1929 A - 1959 M - 1959	36.2/15.2/48.6	6.23
FLUSHING	ACADEMIC	114.4	2,534	80.53		37.0	1915 A - 1955 M - 1955	32.9/18.3/48.8	6.03

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
QUEENS									
*FOREST HILLS	ACADEMIC	102.0	2,273	86.48		23.1	1941	30.3/8.1/61.6	6.25
FRANCIS LEWIS	ACADEMIC	114.5	2,864	85.50		22.2	1960	33.0/4.6/62.3	6.86
GROVER CLEVELAND	ACADEMIC	165.0	3,951	78.58		38.4	1931	15.7/10.4/73.8	6.10
HILLCREST	ACADEMIC SA	—	3,032	81.08		28.4	1971	31.0/20.0/49.0	6.62
JAMAICA	ACADEMIC	112.5	3,088	86.95		20.7	1927	38.3/15.1/46.6	6.52
JOHN ADAMS	ACADEMIC	—	4,539	73.63		30.0	1930	20/10.6/69.4	6.03
JOHN BOWNE	ACADEMIC SA	—	3,698	81.03		33.0	1964	29.1/19.8/51.1	6.04
*LONG ISLAND CITY	ACADEMIC	167.6	3,203	86.35		32.3	1905 A - 1922 M - 1957	9.0/18.6/72.4	5.74

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
QUEENS									
*MARTIN VAN BUREN	ACADEMIC	117.7	3,337	85.96		20.7	1955 A - 1963	33.2/4.6/62.1	6.29
NEWTOWN	ACADEMIC SA	143.3	4,474	87.57		37.5	1922 A -1931 M -1954	16.3/37.1/46.5	5.92
QUEENS	VOCATIONAL S	143.8	1,210	78.00		36.8	1920	13.1/15.1/71.8	7.00
RICHMOND HILL	ACADEMIC	—	2,637	78.70		35.1	1929 M - 1967	17.5/14.9/67.5	6.23
SPRINGFIELD GARDENS	ACADEMIC	101.4	3,067	78.49		33.4	1965	67.5/4.9/27.4	6.24
THOMAS A. EDISON	VOCATIONAL S	125.6	2,301	87.55		18.6	1958	13.7/8.9/77.5	7.00
WILLIAM C. BRYANT	ACADEMIC	—	3,671	79.31		40.8	1939	17.7/24.9/57.4	5.98

190

SCHOOL	TYPE OF SCHOOL	% UTIL. 76-77	ALLOC. REG. 1978	ATTEN. 77-78	TITLE I	% PSEN	YEAR BUILT	ETHNICITY B / H / O	CURR. INDEX
STATEN ISLAND									
CURTIS	ACADEMIC	107.5	2,243	79.56		28.2	1903 A - 1964 M - 1964	21.4/11.3/67.4	6.31
NEW DORP	ACADEMIC	124.3	2,663	78.04		17.9	1936 A - 1962 M - 1963	3.9/2.7/94.3	6.24
*PORT RICHMOND	ACADEMIC	120.4	2,928	82.22		21.9	1927 A - 1940	12.5/4.9/82.6	6.11
*RALPH MCKEE	VOCATIONAL S	114.8	1,299	79.16		47.7	1935	12.7/8.7/78.6	6.94
SUSAN E. WAGNER	ACADEMIC	95.3	2,883	80.47		19.8	1968	9.0/4.7/86.3	6.14
TOTTENVILLE	ACADEMIC EO	118.1	4,798	84.68		18.1	1972	1.8/2.6/95.6	6.66

APPENDIX II

STATISTICAL CORRELATIONS

In order to examine the 1978 fall term allocations in more depth, linear regression analysis was applied. This statistical tool allows one to plot the single straight line which best describes the association between two variables. (The results of a linear regression do not indicate causality). The linear regression produces a correlation coefficient as well as the information necessary to draw the line. This correlation coefficient, "r," is between 1 and -1. If r is close to 1, this means that an increase in one of the variables is accompanied by an increase in the other. If r is close to -1, an increase in one variable is accompanied by a decreasing value in the other. If r is close to zero, there is little association between the two variables.

Linear regression analysis was used to test for the degree of association between the following factors:

1) estimated register and per capita allocation actually received (net - (PSEN + discretes)) fall, 1978
2) curriculum index, fall 1978 and per capita allocation actually received (net - (PSEN + discretes)) fall, 1978
3) attendance rate, 1977-78, and per capita allocation actually received (net - (PSEN + discretes)) fall, 1978
4) curriculum index, fall 1977, and attendance rate, 1977-78.

Register And Per Capita Allocation

When all ninety-nine schools were examined, there was a fairly strong negative correlation between the size of the register and the actual per capita allocation.

$r = -0.6504$

Schools with larger registers generally received less units per student. This probably is a reflection of the allocation of basic support units, which allots a minimum of twenty units with only 0.008 unit per additional student for those schools with registers exceeding 1,000. This assumes economies of scale for administration of larger schools.

However, this correlation is much less significant if one examines vocational/technical and academic/comprehensive schools separately. Most of the smallest schools are vocational/technical schools (only two schools with registers below 2,000, Benjamin Franklin and South Bronx, were not vocational/technical schools) and these schools each have a high curriculum index. These schools account for much of the negative correlation.

For the twenty-one vocational/technical schools:

$r = -0.5739$

However, for the seventy-eight academic/comprehensive schools:

$r = -0.3679$

This last figure does not represent a significant correlation.

Curriculum Index And Per Capita Allocation

For all ninety-nine high schools, there is a strong relationship between the curriculum index and the number of units received per student:

$r = +0.8640$

Once again, the vocational/technical schools are a distinct case, because of the high range of the curriculum index (6.2 - 7.0).

For the vocational/technical schools:

$r = -0.0167$

For the academic/comprehensive schools:

$r = +0.8581$

Attendance And Per Capita Allocation

While there is a positive correlation between attendance and the number of units allocated per student, it is not as significant.

For all schools, (excluding Park West, which was not in existance for 1977-78, and thus had no attendance data yet,):

$r = +0.4015$

For vocational/technical schools:

$r = -0.1687$

For academic/comprehensive schools:

$r = +0.4952$

Curriculum Index And Attendance

Again, there is a positive correlation between the curriculum index and attendance.

For all schools:

$r = +0.5223$

For vocational/technical schools:

$r = +0.3787$

For academic/comprehensive schools:

$r = +0.05568$

APPENDIX III

Authorized Reimbursable Positions - Fall 1978

* Denotes Vocational-Technical Schools

High School	Teachers	Guid. Couns.	School Secy.	Total	Para. Prof.	Spec. Educ.
Abraham Lincoln	3			3	2	
* Alex Hamilton	8			8	6	
* Automotive	5			5	3	
Bay Ridge	23	4	.5	27.5	23	
Boys and Girls	21	3	.5	24.5	19	
Brooklyn Tech.	1			1		
Bushwick	33	7	1.5	41.5	36	
Canarsie	5			5	4	
Clara Barton	15	1		16	14	
Eastern District	37.2	5	1.5	43.7	32	
* East New York	8	1		9	5(D)	
Edward R. Murrow	1			1		1
* Eli Whitney	5			5	4	
Erasmus Hall	14.2	1		15.2	11	
Fort Hamilton	8	1	1	10	5	
F.D. Roosevelt	8	1		9	5	
Franklin K. Lane	21	3	.5	24.5	20	
* Geo. Westinghouse	14	2		16	13	
Geo. W. Wingate	34.2	6	1.5	41.7	30	
James Madison	5	1		6	3	
John Dewey	3			3	1	
John Jay	23	3	.5	26.5	18	
Lafayette	7	1		8	4	
Midwood	5			5	4	
New Utrecht	8		1	9	5	
Prospect Heights	27	4	.5	31.5	27	
Samuel J. Tilden	7	1		8	7	
Sarah J. Hale	13	1	1(C)	15	10	
Sheepshead Bay	2			2	1	
South Shore	11.5		1	12.5	13	
Thomas Jefferson	30	4	1	35	26	
* Wm. E. Grady	5			5	2	
* Wm. H. Maxwell	11	1		12	12	

Authorized Reimbursable Positions - Fall 197B

High School	Teachers	Guid. Couns.	School Secy.	Total	Para. Prof.	Spec. Educ.
Andrew Jackson	21	5	.5	26.5	20	
August Martin	B			B	5	1
* Aviation	7			7	4	
Bayside	3.2			3.2	2	
Beach Channel	2			2		1
Benj. N. Cardozo	6.2			6.2	5	
Far Rockaway	2	1		3		
Flushing						
Forest Hills	3			3	2	
Francis Lewis	4.2	1		5.2	3	
Grover Cleveland	4.2	1		5.2	3	
Hillcrest	3.2			3.2	2	
Jamaica	2.2			2.2		
John Adams	2			2	1	
John Bowne	7.25	1	1	9.25	5	
Long Island City	1			1		
Martin Van Buren	5.2	1		6.2	5	
Newtown	15	1	3(C)	19	19	
* Queens	2			2	1	
Richmond Hill	5	1		6	3	
Springfield Gdns.	3	2		5		
* Thomas A. Edison	1			1		
William C. Bryant	2.4	2		4.4	1	
* Art and Design	6			6	5	
Benjamin Franklin	20.2	4	.5	24.7	20(A)	
Chas E. Hughes	18.2	4	.5	22.7	18	1
* Chelsea	3			3	3	
* Fashion Industries	13	1		14	12	
George Washington	33.2	3	.5	36.7	32	1
H.S. Music & Art	2			2		
Julia Richman	28.2	4	.5	32.7	26	1
Louis D. Brandeis	4B	4.5	1.5	39.5(B)		
* Mabel D. Bacon	4			4	3	
* Manhattan	5			5	5	
Martin L. King Jr.	15	3		18	11	1
Murry Bergtraum	1			1	1	
* N.Y. Printing	10	.5		10.5	7.5	1
Norman Thomas	11	1		12	10	
Park West	21	3	.5	24.5	21	
Seward Park	32	5		37	31	
Stuyvesant	1			1		
Washington Irving	31	3	.5	34.5	27	

Authorized Reimbursable Positions - Fall 1978

High School	Teachers	Guid. Couns.	School Secy.	Total	Para. Prof.	Spec. Educ.
Adlai Stevenson	29	3	1.5	33.5	23	1
* Alfred E. Smith	12	1		13	10	
Bronx H.S. Science	3			3		
C. Columbus	4.4			4.4	3	
DeWitt Clinton	23.2	5	1.5(C)	29.7	28	1
Evander Childs	22	5	.5	27.5	21	
* Grace Dodge	3			3	2	
Harry S. Truman	4.4			4.4		1
Herbert Lehman	6	1		7	6	1
James Monroe	32.2	4.5	1.5	38.2	30.5(B)	
* Jane Addams	16.2	1		17.2	14	
John F. Kennedy	30.2	3	.5	33.7	28	1
Morris	28.2	5	.5	33.7	28	1
* Samuel Gompers	8	1		9	8	
South Bronx	11		1(C)	12	7	
Theo. Roosevelt	37	4	1	42	28	
Walton	23	5	.5	28.5	25	
William H. Taft	32.2	3.5	.5	36.2	27.5	1
Curtis	3			3		
New Dorp	1			1		
Port Richmond	1.2	1		2.2		
* Ralph McKee	2			2		
Susan E. Wagner	1			1		
Tottenville	3			3		

(A) Includes one school neighborhood worker
(B) Plus 150 hours
(C) Secretary Interne or one Secretary Interne included
(D) Plus 1080 hours